

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, November 7, 1985

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The eyes of the Lord are toward the righteous, and His ears toward their cry.—Psalm 34:15.

Visit us, O God, with Your blessing, lead us in the way of truth, and hear our prayer for justice and mercy. May we be honest with our motives and earnest in our supplications that You will bless our land with righteousness and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair had intended to announce that there would be no 1-minute speeches prior to legislative business, but in view of the fact there are only two Members here, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. YOUNG].

DO AS I SAY

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article in the latest issue of the *New Republic*, written by Jacob Weisberg. It is entitled "Do As I Say."

Mr. Weisberg's article reminds us of how we in Congress have imposed a double standard: While the rest of the Nation must comply with employment discrimination laws, Congress has exempted itself.

I commend our colleagues LYNN MARTIN and PAT SCHROEDER for drafting legislation which would end this unfair practice. I also commend our colleague LEON PANETTA for holding hearings on this issue last summer which, I might add, were the first hearings we've ever held on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the mere notion that we—the Nation's lawmakers—can jus-

tify an exemption from the civil rights laws is outrageous at best. The idea that a Member can rationalize discrimination for whatever reasons is to make a mockery of civil rights. The arguments regarding constitutional separation of powers or the speech and debate clause, are flimsy and merely act as a shield against the hypocrisy taking place in the House and the other body.

I urge my colleagues to not only read this article, but to join us in passing reasonable legislation to cure this problem. The country is waiting and watching. Will we be the ones to set an example? Or will we retreat into the sanctity and safety of an exemption which thwarts the very concept of civil rights in America?

[From the *New Republic*, Nov. 18, 1985]

DO AS I SAY

(By Jacob Weisberg)

An employee at the Senate Placement Office who helps match job applicants with positions says she often receives requests from Senate offices for "no minorities." What's more, she honors them. Why? "Maybe there are people in the office that don't take to minorities. Maybe they've had a bad experience with a minority in the past. They're being honest, so why send them someone they're not going to hire?" She adds that she often encourages staffers who make such requests to interview minority applicants anyway. "I tell them that it could cause an embarrassment at home," she says, noting that the office often gets requests for "only minorities," too.

This kind of discrimination on the Hill is nothing new. In 1974 the *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* created a minor furor when it reported that the House placement office regularly removed stipulations like "white only" and "attractive, smart, young, and no Catholics . . ." from hiring orders sent by congressional offices. The House Clerk's office now says that its new computer can't input discriminatory data. But the computer apparently is more enlightened than some members of Congress. Practitioner par excellence of the do-as-I-say-not-as-I-do philosophy, Congress has made itself exempt from Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, creed, and national origin.

Just as members of Congress can legally exclude or fire whomever they want, they are free to ignore the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Equal Pay Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, and a torrent of other laws. These immunities have disturbed a few outspoken legislators for years, and periodically bills are introduced to bring Congress into compliance with its own laws. Rarely are such proposals enthusiastically received. This summer the House Subcommittee on Police and Personnel, chaired by Representative Leon Panetta, did hold hearings on the most recent anti-hypocrisy measures, the best of which is a

proposal sponsored by Representative Lynn Martin of Illinois to protect congressional employees from discrimination by creating a panel of retired judges to hear complaints. But Martin admits that progress is slow. The bill was also referred to the Judiciary and the Government Operations committees, and it is unlikely to reach the floor for a vote this term. Panetta has encouraged Martin and Democratic Representative Pat Schroeder, who has proposed a similar bill, to work on a bipartisan resolution that might make it out of committee.

There are a few flimsy measures already in effect. In 1976, after the furor over Congressman Wayne Hayes's using his position to solicit sexual favors from his secretary Elizabeth Ray, Schroeder helped create a voluntary antidiscrimination hearing board called the Fair Employment Practices Committee. About 130 members have signed a nonbinding agreement (which has never received any support from the House leadership) not to discriminate in hiring. Only staffers who work for signers of the agreement have the privilege of complaining to the FEPC if they feel unfairly treated. Former chairperson Sarah Orrick says that the board seldom convenes, and that she doesn't remember it ever hearing an actual grievance. The reasons are obvious: those who sign the voluntary pledge tend to be those who don't discriminate, and the board has no real power to punish perpetrators or compensate victims.

In 1978, at the urging of John Glenn and others, who pointed out that less than one-third of one percent of the Senate's highest staff positions were held by blacks, and that women did only slightly better, the Senate passed a simple rule forbidding employment discrimination. But Glenn points out that the rule is useless since the Senate neglected to pass any enforcement mechanism. "There was a lot of talk about doing better in the future, and then everybody forgot about it again," he says.

Members of Congress have found several ways to justify their exemptions. Many cite the established need to hire staff members according to regional and political affiliation. When you point out that the Civil Rights Act doesn't prohibit political patronage, they resort to constitutional arguments. Foremost among these is the concept of separation of powers, which some representatives contend prohibits the executive branch from enforcing laws like the Civil Rights Act against the legislative branch. But of course separation of powers works both ways, a fact they overlook when they want the president to open his files under the Freedom of Information Act.

The second argument relies on the "speech and debate clause" of Article One of the Constitution, which protects members from being questioned in court about their legislative activities. Representative Ed Jones of Tennessee recently invoked this notion when he was sued by Anne W. Walker, former manager of the House Restaurant. As chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee on Services, which oversees the restaurant, Jones fired Walker, who claims he told her that a \$45,000 salary

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

was "ridiculous for a woman." A federal court of appeals recently held in favor of Walker's right to sue, saying that selecting restaurant staff is not a legislative procedure, and is thus not covered by the speech and debate clause.

Senator Ernest Hollings (who hired the first black Senate committee chief of staff) offers a distinctly nonconstitutional argument. Legislators, he says, are responsible to their constituents alone. If a racist congressional district wants its representative not to hire any blacks, the representative has that right. Justice Burger agrees. In his dissenting opinion in the highly publicized Hill discrimination suit *Passman v. Davis*, he wrote: "A member of Congress has a right to expect that every person on his or her staff will give total loyalty to the political positions of the member, total confidentiality and total support. This may, on occasion, lead a member to employ a particular person on a racial, ethnic, religious or gender basis thought to be acceptable to the constituency represented. . . ." Congressional offices run more efficiently than other government agencies, where firing a subordinate can entail several years of filling out forms and fighting lawsuits. But for the rest of the country Congress has decided to sacrifice some efficiency to protect individual rights.

Members who argue for consistency, like Representative Andrew Jacobs of Indiana, are indignant at these rationales. "What is this, Mount Olympus?" he asks. "Separation of powers doesn't mean you can't send a congressman to prison for embezzlement. And speech and debate is what members plead when they get caught taking bribes." Jacobs cites a favorite example of what he calls Congress's antinomian behavior: when Congress amended federal campaign laws to prohibit the practice of converting leftover campaign contributions to personal funds upon retirement, it left those elected before 1980 the right to collect and even continue adding to their "closeout" accounts. Jacobs, who continually proposes terminating this novel application of the grandfather clause, refers to it as "saying it's a sin for everybody except those who say it's a sin."

Jacobs is perhaps the only member who favors ending Congress' exemptions across-the-board. Many spout platitudes about "becoming better employers," and "not demanding of others more than we ask of ourselves" on civil rights legislation, but whistle a different tune when asked about an exemption that might make a difference in their own offices. Take OSHA standards, for example, which require minimum space per employee in offices, and which sweatshop offices on the Hill routinely violate. "My god, that would shut the whole place down," exclaims Schroeder. And Glenn concedes, "Before we built the new Senate office building, we violated their standards everywhere." This is not to say that Glenn and Schroeder oppose the idea of OSHA standards on Capitol Hill. But they aren't about to sponsor troublesome bills to bring their own offices into compliance.

There is a practical reason for requiring members of Congress to abide by the strictures they have established for every other American employer. OSHA has saved lives and improved working standards for millions of Americans, but also forbids safe but crowded offices like the ones on the Hill. Civil service rules and the Civil Rights Act have made it hard to fire government workers capriciously, but also make it nearly impossible to terminate incompetents if they

happen to be among the three-quarters of the population that merits special protection because of race, religion, age, or sexual preference. Because Congress doesn't feel the effects of these measures, it isn't much inclined to improve them. If our legislators were subjected to their own laws, which James Madison called an essential condition for the survival of democracy, they would become better lawmakers. The rest of the country might even regain a measure of respect for the bills Congress passes.

NATIONAL JAYCEES WEEK

(Mr. YOUNG of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the week of January 19-25 as "National Jaycees Week."

Founded in 1920 in St. Louis, MO, the United States Jaycees—or the Junior Chamber of Commerce, as it was known then—have a long history of community involvement. Currently there are more than 268,000 Jaycees in 6,500 chapters throughout all 50 States.

The Jaycees welcome young men and women between the ages of 18 and 36 as members. These young people are involved in education, assisting the elderly, fundraising for the handicapped and disease research in addition to other programs and projects that address community needs and problems. Many of the Jaycees programs provide help and assistance that might not otherwise be possible.

Due to the fact that this commemorative week would begin on January 19, 1986, the House is under pressure to approve this resolution by the end of the year. The Senate version of "National Jaycees Week" was passed on November 4, 1985. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important measure.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up H. Con. Res. 203, authorizing printing of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee to explain the nature of the resolution, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the usual and customary resolution which is used to provide amounts from the contingent fund of the House for continuing expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House during the period when the respective committees' primary expense resolutions are being considered by the Committee on House Administration and the House.

For the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1986 and ending at midnight on March 31, 1986, a committee will be entitled to spend 25 percent of the amount made available to it during the first session of the 99th Congress. This figure essentially freezes a committee's spending authorization at the 1985 level for the 3-month interim period.

The authority to incur expenses during this interim period under this resolution will expire as soon as the House agrees to the primary expense resolution covering the second session activities of the respective committees. Any expenses incurred under the authority of this resolution are deducted from the amounts made available to the committees under the primary expense resolution when adopted.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and urge adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That for continuance of necessary investigations and studies by the standing and select committees of the House, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such sums as may be necessary for the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1986, and ending at midnight on March 31, 1986. For the period specified in the preceding sentence, each such committee shall be entitled to one-fourth of the amount made available under expense resolutions for that committee for the first session of the Ninety-ninth Congress.

Sec. 2. The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this resolution shall expire upon agreement by the House to the primary expense resolution for that committee.

Sec. 3. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of that committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 4. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER (Mr. MURTHA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF BROCHURE ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up H. Con. Res. 203, authorizing printing of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 203

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the revised edition of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" shall be printed as a House document, with a suitable paper cover in the style selected by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and with a foreword by the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Junior. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed two hundred and forty-six thousand copies of the brochure for the use of the House of Representatives (of which twenty-five thousand shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary) and there shall be printed fifty-two thousand copies of the brochure for the use of the Senate.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the printing of the revised edition of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," to be printed as a House document, with a suitable paper cover in the style selected by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and with a foreword by the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR.

The Government Printing Office estimates that the cost of this printing will be:

Usual number as a House document.....	\$3,069.70
246,000 additional copies for the House.....	73,942.68
52,000 additional copies for the Senate.....	15,630.16
Total	92,642.54

This concurrent resolution represents a periodic and customary request that such a revised edition of the brochure be reprinted for the use of the House and the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS INCIDENT TO PRESENTATION OF A PORTRAIT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES J. HOWARD

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 228) authorizing printing of the transcript of proceedings of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation incident to presentation of a portrait of the Honorable JAMES J. HOWARD, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 228

Resolved, That the transcript of proceedings of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation on June 26, 1984, incident to presentation of a portrait of the Honorable James J. Howard to the Committee, shall be printed as a House document with illustrations and suitable binding.

Sec. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed, for the use of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, five hundred copies of such document, of which two hundred and fifty copies shall be casebound.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the printing, as a House document with illustrations and suitable binding, the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of June 26, 1984, incident to the presentation of a portrait of the Honorable JAMES J. HOWARD to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The Government Printing Office estimates that the cost of this printing will be:

Usual number as a House document (1,500).....	\$2,700.89
250 additional paperback copies....	124.12
250 additional casebound copies....	977.67
Total	3,901.68

This resolution is a usual and customary request that such proceedings be appropriately memorialized.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3036, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1986

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3036) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 31, 1985.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have reached agreement on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986. This conference report provides \$13.2 billion in recommended appropriations for fiscal year 1986. While this is an increase of \$951 million over the President's budget, primarily due to the amount included for the Postal Service, it is \$84 million under the House-passed bill. The amount recommended is also \$323,625,000 below the allocation to this subcommittee under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the amount recommended by the conferees for fiscal year 1986 is \$215 million below the amount appropriated for discretionary items for fiscal year 1985. As Members all know, the committee has no control over mandatory items.

The conference report before you today is under the House-passed bill but I believe that funding for the various activities provided for in this bill are at levels that the House can fully support.

I am particularly pleased to inform the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations that the House conferees were able to keep faith with those committees by deleting legislative provisions which were included in the Senate-passed bill. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee opposed two amendments, one which would have prohibited the allowance of tax exemptions to any cult, organization, or

other group that has as a purpose the promoting of satanism or witchcraft with malicious intent. The other amendment had to do with the tariff treatment of mixtures containing ethyl alcohol.

The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations opposed an amendment on Federal employees relocation expenses. Even though these amendments had a great deal of popular support and even though many of the conferees favored these amendments I am pleased to tell you that none of them were agreed to by the conferees.

The conferees were of the opinion that these matters should be addressed by the appropriate legislative committees.

Now, let me highlight a few of the significant items in the conference report.

In the U.S. Customs Service, the conferees have recommended funds to retain 887 personnel recommended in the budget to be eliminated and added an additional 473 positions. The budget proposed a reduction in personnel of 887 below present onboard strength, including many Customs inspectors. The committee feels that in view of the severe drug problem in this country, it is not prudent to reduce the very agency that mans our borders and ports of entry. I might point out also that the Customs Service collects about \$12.5 billion in revenue each year.

The committee believes that the high level of drug abuse and related crime in this country requires a strong law enforcement effort to stem the tide of illicit drugs coming into the United States. The proposed reduction would have also slowed down the processing of visitors to this country and of our own citizens returning from

abroad. Further, this reduction would have also slowed down the processing of commercial goods being imported to the United States. More importantly, this reduction would have had a severe adverse impact on the Government's ability to interdict the flow of illegal drugs and other contraband into the country, as well as on its ability to prevent the illegal exportation of high-technology items to unfriendly countries. The conferees, therefore, recommend against the reduction in personnel and have added 473 more positions to strengthen the Customs Service.

The House Appropriations Committee has been very concerned for several years about the very low budget requests for the Internal Revenue Service. Year after year the Congress has restored funds to the IRS and provided additional funding in an attempt to strengthen the tax processing and tax collection activities of the Service. The committee believes that the current problems that the IRS is experiencing in processing tax returns throughout the country is related to a lack of funding. Therefore, the conferees recommend adding \$76 million above the budget request for the Internal Revenue Service. The committee believes strongly that increased staffing levels for the Service are essential in order to achieve more responsive and effective administration of the tax system. As a result of this increase in resources, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to collect about \$450 million in additional revenue by examining more tax returns and accelerate the collection of \$250 million in revenue by closing 6,600 tax shelter cases.

In addition, we will be able to assure that the IRS has the necessary computer capacity for prompt and efficient tax processing in the upcoming filing season. It will also add over 600

positions in IRS service centers to help avoid any repetition of the refund delays and processing errors that plagued millions of taxpayers this past filing season.

In the Postal Service, the conferees have recommended \$820 million for revenue forgone to support nonprofit mailers. The President's budget recommended no funding at all for this program, which has been supported by the Congress for a number of years. The effect of this appropriation will be to prevent exorbitant increases in postal rates for nonprofit mailers. This appropriation would allow rates for nonprofit mailers to increase only to step 16 on the phasing schedule on January 1, 1986.

The conference report also requires that the Postal Service continue 6-day mail delivery including rural mail delivery and continue to provide free mail for the blind and for overseas voting.

After considerable debate, the conferees reached agreement to extend only to May 15, 1986 the prohibition contained in the continuing resolution for 1985 which delayed implementation of certain personnel reforms proposed by the Office of Personnel Management. It is hoped that this extra time can be used to reach an agreement between Congress and the administration on this controversial matter.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good conference report and truly represents a reasonable compromise with the Senate. I might point out that not one single conferee on the part of the House or Senate reserved on any item in the conference report.

I, therefore, urge your favorable consideration.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY

	Fiscal year—		House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
	1985 enacted	1986 estimates				Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY									
Office of the Secretary	56,162,000	78,699,000	54,274,000	76,400,000	54,274,000	—1,888,000	—24,425,000	—22,126,000
International affairs	22,768,000	22,442,000	22,442,000	—326,000	+22,442,000	+22,442,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	18,341,000	17,803,000	25,500,000	23,803,000	23,803,000	+5,462,000	+6,000,000	—1,697,000
Financial Management Service:									
Salaries and expenses	246,251,000	246,902,000	244,621,000	244,621,000	244,621,000	—1,630,000	—2,281,000
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms	172,113,000	173,725,000	174,212,000	178,825,000	174,212,000	+2,099,000	+487,000	—4,613,000
<hr/>									
U.S. Customs Service:									
Salaries and expenses	669,734,000	656,702,000	725,000,000	709,000,000	717,000,000	+47,266,000	+60,298,000	—8,000,000	+8,000,000
Operations and maintenance, air interdiction program	55,425,000	60,425,000	60,425,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+19,575,000	+14,575,000	+14,575,000
Customs forfeiture fund (limitation on availability of deposits)	(6,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
Customs services at small airports (to be derived from fees collected)	(42,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(+33,000)
Total, U.S. Customs Service	725,159,000	717,127,000	785,425,000	784,000,000	792,000,000	+66,841,000	+74,873,000	+6,575,000	+8,000,000
<hr/>									
U.S. Mint	47,671,000	47,942,000	46,954,000	46,500,000	46,500,000	—1,171,000	—1,442,000	—454,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	198,752,000	199,215,000	197,225,000	195,225,000	195,225,000	—3,527,000	—3,990,000	—2,000,000
<hr/>									
Internal Revenue Service:									
Salaries and expenses	106,310,000	98,811,000	95,932,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	—12,310,000	—4,811,000	—1,932,000
Processing tax returns	996,060,000	1,019,391,000	1,103,041,000	1,005,000,000	1,103,041,000	+106,981,000	+83,650,000	+98,041,000
Examinations and appeals	1,380,486,000	1,419,451,000	1,425,902,000	1,400,000,000	1,425,902,000	+45,416,000	+6,451,000	+25,902,000
Investigations, collections and taxpayer service	1,091,741,000	1,073,679,000	1,064,325,000	1,055,000,000	1,064,325,000	—27,416,000	—9,354,000	+9,325,000
Subtotal, IRS operating accounts	3,574,597,000	3,611,332,000	3,689,200,000	3,554,000,000	3,687,268,000	+112,671,000	+75,936,000	—1,932,000	+133,268,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—Continued

	Fiscal year—		House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
	1985 enacted	1986 estimates				Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
Payment where energy credit exceeds liability for tax.....	100.00					-100.00			
Federal tax lien revolving fund.....	9,000,000					-9,000,000			
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	3,583,697,000	3,611,332,000	3,689,200,000	3,554,000,000	3,687,268,000	+103,571,000	+75,936,000	-1,932,000	+133,268,000
U.S. Secret Service.....	292,649,000	290,340,000	283,805,000	298,805,000	294,000,000	+1,351,000	+3,660,000	+10,195,000	-4,805,000
Total, title I, new budget (obligational) authority Department of the Treasury.....	5,363,563,000	5,383,085,000	5,523,658,000	5,402,179,000	5,534,345,000	+170,782,000	+151,260,000	+10,687,000	+132,166,000
TITLE II—U.S. POSTAL SERVICE									
Payment to the Postal Service fund.....	1,209,129,000	39,128,000	361,121,000	801,000,000	820,000,000	-389,129,000	+780,872,000	-141,121,000	+19,000,000
TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT									
Compensation of the President.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000				
Office of Administration.....	16,240,000	15,794,000	15,597,000	15,597,000	15,597,000	-643,000	-197,000		
The White House Office.....	25,189,000	25,499,000	24,906,000	24,906,000	24,906,000	-283,000	-593,000		
Executive residence at the White House.....	4,658,000	4,719,000	4,577,000	4,577,000	4,577,000	-81,000	-142,000		
Official residence of the Vice President.....	219,000	204,000	204,000	204,000	204,000	-15,000			
Special assistance to the President.....	1,676,000	1,694,000	1,659,000	1,794,000	1,794,000	+118,000	+100,000	+135,000	
Council of Economic Advisers.....	2,560,000	2,381,000	2,301,000	2,301,000	2,301,000	-259,000	-80,000		
Office of Policy Development.....	3,020,000	2,828,000	2,726,000	2,726,000	2,726,000	-294,000	-102,000		
National Security Council.....	4,605,000	4,748,000	4,627,000	4,627,000	4,627,000	+22,000	-121,000		
National Critical Materials Council.....	200,000		500,000	250,000	500,000	+300,000	+500,000		+250,000
Office of Management and Budget.....	38,852,000	39,420,000	37,689,000	36,909,000	37,299,000	-1,553,000	-2,121,000	-390,000	+390,000
Office of Federal Procurement Policy.....	1,630,000	1,656,000	1,611,000	1,611,000	1,611,000	-19,000	-45,000		
Unanticipated needs.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000				
Total, title III, new budget (obligational) authority, Executive Office of the President.....	100,099,000	100,193,000	97,647,000	96,752,000	97,392,000	-2,707,000	-2,801,000	-255,000	+640,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES									
Administrative Conference of the United States.....	1,480,000	1,484,000	1,450,000	1,430,000	1,430,000	-50,000	-54,000	-20,000	
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	2,148,000	2,110,000	2,058,000	2,041,000	2,041,000	-107,000	-69,000	-17,000	
Advisory Committee on Federal Pay.....	220,000	222,000	219,000	210,000	210,000	-10,000	-12,000	-9,000	
Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial salaries.....	160,000					-160,000			
Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.....	710,000	749,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	+20,000	-19,000		
Federal Election Commission.....	13,016,000	12,756,000	12,433,000	12,433,000	12,433,000	-583,000	-323,000		
General Services Administration:									
Federal buildings fund:									
Appropriation.....	348,000			7,000,000	7,000,000	+6,652,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000	
Limitation on availability of revenue:									
1. Construction and acquisition of facilities.....	(150,141,000)	(243,419,000)	(198,444,000)	(243,419,000)	(243,419,000)	(+93,278,000)		(+44,975,000)	
2. Repairs and alterations.....	(221,809,000)	(264,096,000)	(269,096,000)	(269,096,000)	(269,096,000)	(+47,287,000)	(+5,000,000)		
3. Purchase contract payments.....	(178,911,000)	(135,100,000)	(135,100,000)	(135,100,000)	(135,100,000)	(-43,811,000)			
4. Rental of space.....	(865,000,000)	(866,000,000)	(866,000,000)	(866,000,000)	(866,000,000)	(+1,000,000)			
5. Real property operations.....	(689,899,000)	(710,557,000)	(709,678,000)	(709,678,000)	(709,678,000)	(+19,779,000)	(-879,000)		
6. Program direction.....	(118,509,000)	(55,689,000)	(55,481,000)	(55,481,000)	(55,481,000)	(-63,028,000)	(-208,000)		
7. Design and construction services.....	(59,596,000)	(123,094,000)	(123,094,000)	(133,227,000)	(133,227,000)	(+73,631,000)	(+10,133,000)	(+10,133,000)	
8. Unobligated balances.....	(348,000)					(-348,000)			
Total, Federal buildings fund (Limitations).....	(2,284,213,000)	(2,397,955,000)	(2,356,893,000)	(2,412,001,000)	(2,412,001,000)	(+127,788,000)	(+14,046,000)	(+55,108,000)	
Operating expenses, personal property.....	160,700,000	164,610,000	164,257,000	163,257,000	163,257,000	+2,557,000	-1,353,000	-1,000,000	
(By transfer).....	(2,200,000)					(-2,200,000)			
Federal property resources activities:									
Operating expenses.....	38,921,000	40,808,000	40,748,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	+1,079,000	-808,000	-748,000	
National defense stockpile transaction fund.....			10,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000	+10,000,000	+5,000,000
(Limitation on availability of revenue).....	(185,000,000)					(-185,000,000)			
Total, Federal property resources activities.....	38,921,000	40,808,000	50,748,000	55,000,000	60,000,000	+21,079,000	+19,192,000	+9,252,000	+5,000,000
General activities:									
General management and administration:									
Salaries and Expenses.....	136,597,000	123,598,000	124,310,000	124,310,000	124,310,000	-12,287,000	+712,000		
(By transfer).....	(2,200,000)					(-2,200,000)			
Office of Information Resources Management:									
Operating expenses.....	33,348,000	30,723,000	30,630,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-3,348,000	-723,000	-630,000	
Office of the Inspector General.....	21,438,000	19,369,000	19,305,000	19,305,000	19,305,000	-2,133,000	-64,000		
Allowances and office staff for former Presidents.....	1,151,000	1,208,000	931,600	1,151,000	1,100,000	-51,000	-108,000	+168,400	-51,000
Expenses, Presidential transition.....	3,000,000					-3,000,000			
Total, general activities.....	195,534,000	174,898,000	175,176,600	174,766,000	174,715,000	-20,819,000	-183,000	-461,600	-51,000
Total, General Services Administration.....	395,503,000	380,316,000	390,181,600	400,023,000	404,972,000	+9,469,000	+24,656,000	+14,790,400	+4,949,000
National Archives and Records Service:									
Operating expenses.....	98,759,000	99,549,000	103,513,000	101,363,000	101,363,000	+2,604,000	+1,814,000	-2,150,000	
Federal Personnel Activities									
Office of Personnel Management:									
Salaries and expenses:									
Appropriation.....	106,409,000	102,481,000	99,846,000	99,846,000	99,846,000	-6,563,000	-2,635,000		
Limitation.....	(51,135,000)	(54,202,000)	(52,844,000)	(54,202,000)	(54,202,000)	(+3,067,000)		(+1,358,000)	
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits.....	1,341,553,000	1,606,165,000	1,606,165,000	1,606,165,000	1,606,165,000	+264,612,000			
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....	4,407,833,000	4,407,234,000	4,407,234,000	4,407,234,000	4,407,234,000	-599,000			
Total, Office of Personnel Management.....	5,855,795,000	6,115,880,000	6,113,245,000	6,113,245,000	6,113,245,000	+257,450,000	-2,635,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—Continued

	Fiscal year—		House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
	1985 enacted	1986 estimates				Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
Merit Systems Protection Board:									
Salaries and expenses	20,671,000	20,907,000	20,349,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-671,000	-907,000	-349,000	
Limitation	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)				
Office of special counsel	4,627,000	4,724,000	4,594,000	4,594,000	4,594,000	-33,000	-130,000		
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	25,298,000	25,631,000	24,943,000	24,594,000	24,594,000	-704,000	-1,037,000	-349,000	
Federal Labor Relations Authority	17,364,000	17,613,000	17,364,000	17,064,000	17,064,000	-300,000	-549,000	-300,000	
Total, Federal personnel activities	5,898,457,000	6,159,124,000	6,155,552,000	6,154,903,000	6,154,903,000	+256,446,000	-4,221,000	-649,000	
U.S. Tax Court: Salaries and expenses	22,694,000	24,556,000	24,556,000	24,556,000	24,556,000	+1,862,000			
Total, title IV, new budget (obligational) authority, independent agencies	6,433,147,000	6,680,866,000	6,690,692,600	6,697,689,000	6,702,638,000	+269,491,000	+21,772,000	+11,945,400	+4,949,000
General Provision									
General reduction			-35,250,475	-138,960,920				+35,250,475	+138,960,920
Grant total:									
New budget (obligational) authority	13,105,938,000	12,203,272,000	13,237,868,125	12,858,659,080	13,154,375,000	+48,437,000	+951,103,000	-83,493,125	+295,715,920
(Limitations)	(2,527,590,000)	(2,461,432,000)	(2,419,012,000)	(2,475,478,000)	(2,475,478,000)	(-52,112,000)	(+14,046,000)	(+56,466,000)	
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP									
Total	13,105,938,000	12,203,272,000	13,237,868,125	12,858,659,080	13,154,375,000	+48,437,000	+951,103,000	-83,493,125	+295,715,920
Amount in this bill	(13,105,938,000)	(12,203,272,000)	(13,237,868,125)	(12,858,659,080)	(13,154,375,000)	(+48,437,000)	(+951,103,000)	(-83,493,125)	(+295,715,920)
Prior year outlays associated with this bill									
Total Congressional mandatory and discretionary	13,105,938,000	12,203,272,000	13,237,868,125	12,858,659,080	13,154,375,000	+48,437,000	+951,103,000	-83,493,125	+295,715,920
Mandatory (total)	(5,749,736,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(+263,913,000)			
(Mandatory new)	(5,749,736,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(6,013,649,000)	(+263,913,000)			
(Prior year)									
Discretionary (new)	(7,356,202,000)	(6,189,623,000)	(7,224,219,125)	(6,845,010,080)	(7,140,726,000)	(-215,476,000)	(+951,103,000)	(-83,493,125)	(+295,715,920)

□ 1015

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] for his consideration and the very great kindnesses that he has shown all of us as Members, both the majority and the minority on that committee. I also want to commend him for the expeditious manner in which this conference was held. I think we worked it out in a manner that was workmanlike and we resolved our differences and did not take a couple of days to do this conference.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very responsible piece of spending legislation. I know we have a lot of doubts in this body about bills, particularly when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money, and a lot of concern, and I can give my assurance that every consideration was given to the taxpayer.

If Members liked this bill when it left the House and before it went to conference, they will love this conference report, because we did at least trim \$83 million out, and I know that should cause palpitations in the hearts of tax savers, and I see one palpitating over here.

This has three important parts, Mr. Speaker, and I think the chairman outlined those very well so I am not going to reiterate these same points, but I would like to make the point that in three areas, spending was increased, the most notable being that of revenue forgone. This bill is less as a result of the conference work than it was when it left this House and the House recommendation. We left \$820

million in revenue forgone. This is the subsidy to nonprofit publications on mailing. The OMB recommendation was absolutely zero. We did not concur with that rationale, and \$820 million was the compromise between the Senate and the House version. We think that is responsible, we think it is necessary, and it was left in there.

We also increased the IRS and we also increased the expenditures for Customs, and we think that is responsible. For every dollar expended in IRS appropriations, we get a return of some \$9 back. In the case of Customs, for every dollar expended we get some \$14 back. We think that is responsible in light of the fact that we are leaving \$80 billion on the table this year, Mr. Speaker, because of the inability of the IRS to fully audit or do field audits in collecting those taxes that are due the Federal Government. We think that is a tremendous amount of money in light of the fact that we are trying to save some \$50 billion in spending cuts in the budget, when we are leaving \$80 billion on the table that is due and owing to the Federal Government because of an inability to collect.

We want to increase that efficiency. We also know that it gives us a great revenue leverage, and we desperately need that.

In the case of Customs, we have the problem of drug interdiction, and we think it is extremely important that we tighten up the borders of the United States.

In these three cases, we did increase expenditures. This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and I recommend it to my colleagues, both the majority and the minority, because it is a responsible

bill. It was a responsible effort, and once again, I commend the chairman and the other Members of the House who were on the conference committee for the fine work that they did. It was a good piece of work and it was enjoyable doing this kind of work because it made one feel that we had really accomplished something that I think the focus of this entire House reflects in responsible spending patterns. I think this is a responsible piece of work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the great, newly 64-year-old ranking member of this committee who is a real pleasure to work with, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Not yet. It will be Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 3036, the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986.

I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, Ed ROYBAL, for bringing a well-balanced and fiscally responsible conference report to the floor. Every member of the subcommittee can attest that Ed ROYBAL is a fair chairman who listens and acts on the concerns of the Members of this House. As a long-time member of this subcommittee, I've served with the best—Vaughn Gary of Virginia, Tom Steed of Oklahoma, and others—and it's a pleasure for me to work with Chairman ROYBAL, and also with his faithful partner and counsel, Tex Gunnels, who has also been my friend for 27 years, and a very, very able gentleman and counsel to that subcommittee.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend JOE SKEEN for his work on this bill as the ranking minority member of the Treasury Subcommittee. He's done a fine job his first year on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, 46 percent of the money appropriated in this bill is for mandatory items. The payments for retired Federal employee health benefits and to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, along with the President's salary, amount to \$6 billion out of the \$13.1 billion provided in this conference agreement. These payments are fixed costs mandated by law. The Appropriations Committee has no control over this mandatory spending, and the amount provided in this bill is the same as the administration requested.

Three agencies will spend 75 percent of the discretionary appropriations provided in this conference report.

The Customs Service was provided additional resources to continue the international war on drugs and to collect several billion dollars in duties and taxes.

The Internal Revenue Service funding was increased to correct the tax return processing problems of last year and to strengthen tax compliance. When the Government pays out almost \$200 million in interest alone on tax refunds, it's time to provide the resources necessary to get the job done.

In fact, the administration now agrees with this assessment and urged the conferees to accept the funding level provided in the House bill.

That letter from the administration follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, October 29, 1985.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on
Appropriations, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CONTE: As you consider final action on the FY 1986 budget for the Department of the Treasury, I strongly urge that funding levels requested in the President's budget be adopted in conference for all Treasury bureaus, except for the Internal Revenue Service. I am requesting that the \$3.689 billion level approved by the House be adopted for the Internal Revenue Service. This level has the approval of the Administration.

For bureaus other than the Internal Revenue Service, the Department's FY 1986 budget submitted to the Congress earlier this year was, in our judgment, the amount necessary to carry out our diverse responsibilities. It included only those items that were fully justifiable and essential to the accomplishment of our missions, and reflected substantial savings in productivity and streamlined administrative operations. Accordingly, we continue to support the President's budget request for all these bureaus. In total, the President's budget for these bureaus is below both the House and Senate approved levels.

We believe the \$3.689 billion level approved by the House for the Internal Revenue Service is vital to provide for adequate

tax administration in FY 1986. These resources are needed to restore a high level of quality in the Service and to assure an effective tax filing season. The \$206 million reduction from the House allowance proposed by the Senate would jeopardize on-going efforts to revitalize tax processing capabilities and would reduce revenues at a time when they are critically needed. We encourage the conferees to identify reductions elsewhere in the bill to offset this increase for the Internal Revenue Service.

I greatly appreciate the continuing support provided by you and your Committee for Treasury programs during these difficult fiscal times. I ask that you give careful consideration to these issues.

Sincerely,

JOHN F.W. ROGERS,
Assistant Secretary
of the Treasury (Management).

Mr. John Rogers, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, wrote to me requesting "the \$3.689 billion level approved by the House" and reconfirming that "this level has the approval of the administration."

The third major discretionary item is the postal subsidy for nonprofit mailers. The payment provided in this conference agreement is \$390 million less than the amount appropriated last year. Since the administration requested no Federal appropriation, the \$820 million payment accounts for 86 percent of the increase over the President's budget.

Although this amount is scored against the bill, the President's budget did not actually call for the elimination of the reduced mail rate program, but instead proposed to use revenues from other classes of mail to finance the subsidy.

The budget claimed that "legislation will enable the Postal Service to continue the subsidy for most existing subsidized mailers." No legislation was sent to the Hill, so the committee was forced to appropriate the funds.

Even with funding increases for the Customs Service and the IRS and with \$820 million for the postal subsidy, discretionary spending in this conference agreement is \$215 million below the fiscal year 1985 enacted level. This conference report is better than a freeze. It provides a significant spending cut from last year.

The House and Senate bills also contained several language provisions, and the conferees generally deferred to the concerns expressed by the authorizing committees and the administration. On amendment 83, however, the conferees took a "middle-of-the-road" position on the longstanding dispute involving OPM pay-for-performance and RIF regulations.

Based on a compromise that I offered last year, the ban on the implementation of the regulations was lifted on July 1, 1985. Contrary to administration objections, the conference agreement reimposes the ban until May 15, 1986, but allows OPM to revise the regulations in the interim.

It is not a perfect solution, but I hope this is the last time this issue will be considered in the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It balances fiscal restraint with the obligation we have to fund the programs in this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 3036.

□ 1025

I might say in closing that I spoke with OMB last Friday, and at that time they were discussing the possible recommendations of a veto because they felt that we had appropriated too much money here, and also they were very, very disturbed about the language prohibiting the implementation of the OPM regulations.

I begged them to reconsider; I told them the work that we had done in the conference on the OPM language; I was opposed to it and I did everything I could to modify it. We did modify it; unfortunately they seemed to be very upset about this, and I learned this morning that they may be calling me shortly to inform me they are going to veto this bill.

I would like to inform them right now, if they are watching the boob tube down there in the White House that I think they are making a mistake, and I hope that they will not veto this bill, and if they do veto it, I will have to stand on this floor to try to do everything I can to override that veto.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. I want to echo the sentiments of my good friend from New Mexico, the ranking minority member [Mr. SKEEN] and the sentiments from my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] in saying that it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be able to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Massachusetts who not only serves his party, but his country so well, both in the appropriations process and in this House.

I would like to also thank the gentleman for what I know was his tenacious work in the subcommittee, working with the gentleman from Virginia and myself with reference to the OPM regulations.

I also want to reiterate to him my concern that this matter be resolved in a positive fashion from the administration's standpoint, and from the employees' standpoint.

I want to reiterate at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that Constance Horner, the new Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in my opinion has been working very positively,

particularly and pointedly with Congressman WOLF from Virginia in attempting to resolve the differences that we have had between the administration and the Congress on this issue.

I am happy to say, and I see the gentleman from Virginia on his feet, that I believe that we have come very close to a resolution of the differences between the administration and the Congress, and as a result of that, I would very much hope that they would not use that as a reason for vetoing this bill, and would agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] that would be a mistake.

The gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Massachusetts have both been working very hard to bring this matter to resolution, and I am pleased to say that I think we are very close to putting this matter behind us for good.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, again congratulate him for his outstanding work on this subcommittee, in the Appropriations Committee as its ranking member, as one of the senior Members of this House he does an outstanding job on behalf of the entire country.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank my good friends from Maryland for those remarks.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank my chairman for yielding, and again want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], who is the chairman of the Treasury-Postal Subcommittee. As has been stated by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], Mr. ROYBAL does an excellent job at handling a very difficult and complicated task; and those of us who are younger members on the committee are proud to serve under his leadership and to benefit from his teachings.

At this time, I would ask the chairman to yield for a brief colloquy.

Mr. ROYBAL. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman and rise to engage in a colloquy concerning amendment No. 83. I would ask the chairman if the Senate receding on amendment No. 83 with an amendment barring implementation, promulgation, administration, enforcement or reissuance of certain Office of Personnel Management regulations means that existing proposed regulations published on August 30, 1985, are also banned as falling within the ambit of previously banned proposed regulations?

Mr. ROYBAL. The gentleman is correct. The proposed regulations published on August 30, 1985, are a reissuance of previously banned proposed

regulations. It is the intent of the conferees that those proposed regulations and the earlier proposed regulations shall have no effect of law until at least May 15, 1986.

Mr. HOYER. Is the gentleman saying that it is the intent of the conferees that no effect be given to any regulations of the type banned by amendment No. 83 until May 15, 1986?

Mr. ROYBAL. That is the intent and I think it is important to make that very clear. Two years ago the Office of Personnel Management decided to ignore the ban and the Court had to stop OPM from implementing the regulations. So, for the purpose of the record, I think it is very important to point out that it is congressional intent that these proposals not move forward at least until May 15, 1986.

Mr. HOYER. Am I also correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the intent of the conferees is that no agency may implement these regulations, including OPB?

Mr. ROYBAL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding for that colloquy, and I rise in strong support of the conference report. We have worked hard and long. The bill is substantially below that which it was when it went to the Senate. We nevertheless have provided, I think, funds appropriate to ensure proper staffing levels in IRS and in Customs, and I am in strong support of the conference committee report.

I again congratulate my chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], who have both worked so hard to effect this end.

Mr. SKEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SKEEN. I would like to ask this question of either the chairman or the gentleman from Maryland: The colloquy that you have just engaged in, does that appreciably change the terms of the ban, and so forth? Because this was not information that we have prior to this meeting, and we are a little concerned about whether there is any real change in the intent or not. We are not quibbling, but just want to get the record straight.

Mr. ROYBAL. There is no change in the intent. The intent has been right along that the date be May 15, 1986.

Mr. SKEEN. That is what we agree to in conference.

Mr. ROYBAL. That is what we agreed, and there is no change in the intent whatsoever.

Mr. SKEEN. Does OPM have the right to revise, in any way, there regulations in regard to this ban?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes, the OPM does have that right.

□ 1035

Mr. HOYER. In further response, I would say, as the gentleman well knows because he was part of the effort to effect this, we agreed to revisions because clearly the intent is to try to reach an accommodation between OPM and the Congress, and therefore it is essential to reaching that accommodation that they have the ability to revise. As I said in my opening statement, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] I know has been working very closely with the Office of Personnel Management, with Miss Horner who, I would reiterate, is working, in my opinion, very forthrightly with the Congress to try to bring this matter to a successful conclusion.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia for all his work toward that end.

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate his statement. I was trying to establish whether or not there had been any movement since the conference. In view of the language that was put in, you folks worked very hard on it, to make sure that there had been no travel as far as intentions were concerned or a change in the intentions that we had agreed on in conference because I did not know whether you had had the opportunity to have any conversation with OPM or any connection with them insofar as this language.

Mr. HOYER. Briefly, in response, I would say the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] really has been carrying the ball on this issue. I understand there has been movement and it is positive movement. That is to say, we are moving closer and not further away. This language simply clarifies the intent of the conferees so that the administration will know clearly where we are and we know clearly where they are, and I think we are going to meet in the middle.

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield for one last question, is this the last time this ban will be offered?

Mr. HOYER. I do not want to comment to that until such time as the accommodation is a reality. I will leave that to Mr. WOLF's judgment, because he is the one who has been active.

Mr. SKEEN. I did not expect the gentleman to reply.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I say to the gentleman from New Mexico it is the expectation of the chairman of the committee and every Member that an accommodation will be reached and that this subject matter will not again be a subject of debate the next time we bring a bill to the floor.

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the chairman once again.

Mr. Speaker, I thank also the gentleman from Maryland for his response.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ROYBAL, with regards to the President's original budget submission which proposed a 5-percent pay cut for Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, when our committee marked up this bill, the administration had not changed its position on the 5-percent pay cut for fiscal year 1986. Subsequent to the passage of H.R. 3036 by the House, the administration sensed that the Congress would not cut Federal pay and requested instead that Congress provide sufficient funds so as to cover Federal pay absent a 5-percent pay cut. Mr. Speaker, because the request from the administration came after the committee and House had passed this bill, adequate funding for the full Federal pay is not contained in this bill. It is my fear that the departments and agencies funded by this bill will be unable to fully fund the number of personnel requested by the committee. This is particularly troublesome to me when we consider the funding levels provided for the Customs Service and the IRS, both of which are increased and greatly needed. When the committee heard testimony from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget this spring, he testified that should the Congress and the administration choose not to cut Federal pay, a Governmentwide amendment or supplemental would be requested to make up the difference. Although the administration has since made such a request, as I have stated, it came after the committee and the House had passed this bill. Therefore, I would like to ask the chairman whether or not it would be appropriate for the committee and the agencies to assume, that when the committee considers a supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986, that one of the items considered would be the funding of the difference of pay levels contained in this bill and that approved by the Congress and the administration?

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman, I would say the answer to that question is a definite yes. The gentleman probably will remember this matter was discussed in subcommittee. We decided not to

enter into a lengthy debate with regard to the increase in pay due to the fact that we had been assured that a supplemental would be sent to the House at the appropriate time. So it would be appropriate for the committee and the agencies to assume that when the committee considers supplemental appropriations for 1986 that one of the items would definitely be the matter of the difference in pay.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the chairman for his response.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, would it be appropriate for the agencies to assume that the committee and Congress do not intend for the Department and agencies funded under this bill to use moneys appropriated for additional personnel for the cost of funding the difference between the pay levels set in this bill and that actually agreed upon between the Congress and the administration?

Mr. ROYBAL. I am very glad to answer that question for the very simple reason that in the past this committee, this House, and this Congress have appropriated funds for additional positions and those positions have not been filled. It is the intent of this legislation, or it would be when enacted, the intent of this House and the Congress as a whole to fill those positions, those additional positions, that this bill recommends and that additional funds be used only for that purpose and no other purpose.

Mr. COLEMAN. I thank the chairman very much for his answer. I think that is the intent of what we worked on, all of us in the subcommittee, through your leadership and that of the ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the chairman, Mr. ROYBAL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. "JOE" SKEEN, for their cooperation and help and also Mr. CONTE who is no longer in the Chamber.

I also want to acknowledge the staff. Having been a staff person up here on Capitol Hill for a long time, myself, I think the help that I have gotten from the staff has been super.

I want to publicly thank them. I also want to recognize Congressman HOYER for his work on these OPM rates. Without his help, there is no way we could have made these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I want to talk about one provision in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, what I have in my hand is a babushka doll which says on the bottom, "Made in the U.S.S.R."

Mr. Speaker, this doll was made by slave labor in the Soviet Union. We have language in this report which re-

quires the Secretary of the Treasury and Customs to bring a case to prohibit the importation of these wood products which are clearly made by slave labor in the Soviet Union. We have several indications that this is the fact.

There was an article in Reader's Digest which said:

In February of this year, the United States State Department exposed Russian labor camps in a detailed study concluding that, "Soviet authorities still exploit forced labor on a large scale for both domestic and Western export markets." There can be little doubt now that much of today's Soviet economy is built on the backs of the wretched men, women, and children who toil in nearly 2,000 Russian prisons and forced labor camps.

And I stress, and I have proof, that there are children in these camps.

Thousands more forced laborers died in the Kolyma goldfields of Siberia in the 1930's. Nobel Prize-winning Russian author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn documented this nearly a decade ago in his monumental work "The Gulag Archipelago."

Mr. Speaker, I submit this article for the RECORD.

"MADE IN U.S.S.R."—BY FORCED LABOR

(By Joseph A. Harriss)

Western nations need to take a closer look at their Soviet imports. Many were manufactured at a terrible price in human suffering.

In Frankfurt, West Germany, I was interviewing some recent inmates of Soviet forced-labor camps. One woman pointed at the wooden folding chair that I was sitting on. "That's a souvenir from the Gulag," she said. On the bottom was marked "Made in U.S.S.R.," followed by the code 133340, indicating the camp where it was produced. The United States last year imported hundreds of such chairs, part of our multimillion dollar trade in which we buy the products of Soviet convict labor, in contravention of U.S. law.

In February of this year, the U.S. State Department exposed Russian labor camps in a detailed study concluding that "Soviet authorities still exploit forced labor on a large scale . . . for both domestic and Western export markets."

There can be little doubt now that much of today's Soviet economy is built on the backs of wretched men, women and children who toil in nearly 2000 Russian prisons and forced-labor camps. What is less well known is that importing the products of forced labor violates an explicit American law, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. Section 307 states: "All goods, wares, articles and merchandise mined, produced or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or forced labor . . . shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited."

Until recently, few realized the extent to which the Soviet Union still depends on convict labor—the only major industrialized nation that makes it a mainstay of its economy. To be sure, many Americans remember that Stalin built spectacular projects like the Volga-Don canal, the second Trans-Siberian railway and entire new towns at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives. Thousands more forced laborers died in the

Kolyma gold fields of Siberia in 1930s. Nobel Prize-winning Russian author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn documented this nearly a decade ago in his monumental work *The Gulag Archipelago*.

But it took the controversy between the United States and its NATO allies over the Siberian gas pipeline to Europe to focus attention on continued Soviet dependence on this practice. The State Department report drew on CIA intelligence, including satellite photos, and suggested that the Soviets had indeed used forced labor on the pipeline, especially for clearing forests and building roads. Commented Sen. William L. Armstrong (R., Colo.), who originally requested the study, "This is a shameful situation beyond the comprehension of most Americans."

The number of convict laborers in the U.S.S.R. is down from its peak of 15 million under Stalin, but they still number an estimated four million, and the conditions under which they work are hardly less nightmarish. Far from fulfilling Marx's promise to free workers from their chains, the Soviet system has systematically enslaved them.

"Graveyard Soup." Goaded the West's conscience on the forced-labor issue are the International Society for Human Rights, based in Frankfurt, and the International Sakharov Committee in Copenhagen. Last fall in Bonn the two groups sponsored an international tribunal of parliamentarians, labor leaders and academics that heard former prisoners graphically portray brutal working conditions in sub-zero temperatures, with inmates picking lichen off trees for nourishment. The tribunal concluded that "prisoners, among them women and children, are forced to work under conditions of extreme hardship." The tribunal chairman declared, "We have presented the truth to the world, and no one can say, 'I did not know.'"

Details of what the world must know are spelled out by such former camp inmates as Julia Voznesenskaya, 43, a frail dissident author from Leningrad. She was arrested by KGB security police after she boldly scrawled on a wall, "You strangle our freedom, but you can't chain people's souls." Charged with "anti-Soviet slander," she spent three years in prison and Siberian camps. One of her main task was making work clothes and uniforms for the Red Army. Shifts stretched to 12 hours to meet impossibly high production quotas. Those who failed to meet them had their meager food ration cut. With gallows humor, she and her fellow laborers called the thin, half-putrid fish broth served every day "graveyard soup"—it contained nothing but bones. Prisoners with tiny children often looked on helplessly as the toddlers sickened and died.

Yuri Belov, 42, spent 15 years in prisons, camps, and banishment and psychiatric hospitals. He was first arrested in 1963 for writing "subversive" poems and founding a community of Catholic believers. The charge: "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." He was sent to camp ZhKh 385/11 in Mordovia, 200 miles southeast of Moscow.

Here, 2000 convicts each assembled 140 wooden chairs per shift, which were sent to a "free" factory in Minsk. There, finishing touches were put on before the chairs were exported to the West. Thus the Kremlin could claim the goods were made by "free" workers.

Belov remembers with a sardonic smile the political commissar who told ZhKh 385/11 inmates to be proud because their work

earned the motherland hard currency and cost almost nothing. Indeed! The motherland paid Belov and his fellow convicts 60 rubles a month—"free" workers got about 100 rubles—but withheld 75 percent to pay for the minimal camp food, clothing and maintenance.

Sematic Games. Frequently those in Soviet forced-labor camps are there on flimsy pretexts such as "hooliganism" or "parasitism" (being unemployed). Vladimir Bukovsky, a scientist who spent 11 years in the Gulag, writes, "Such a high percentage of criminality is artificially maintained by the state for economic motives."

One of the first signs of a big new Soviet construction project is an anti-crime campaign. Police round up men and women for the forced-labor pool, sometimes resorting to primitive entrapment. Vladimir Borisov, an exiled founder of the underground free labor union SMOT, who now lives in France, told me of a friend of his, Ivar Jukovski. As Jukovski was shopping in a Riga clothing store, an old lady asked him to try on a jacket to see if it would fit her son. Police promptly arrested him for shoplifting, and the "corrective labor colonies" had another worker.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) runs the forced-labor system, supplying workers to other state agencies. Because workers under armed guard are not suitable for outdoor work, convicts are often put on parole or probation on condition that they perform compulsory labor. Much of the Soviet chemical industry was constructed this way in the 1960s—so today all such workers are known in camp slang as *khimiki*, or "chemists." In the big oil and gas fields, they can amount to some 20 percent of the adult population. This forced labor without confinement enables the Kremlin to play semantic games and deny that convicts are used, for instance, on the pipeline to Europe.

Political dissidents, however, are seldom released even conditionally. Their "crimes" often fall under the infamous Article 70 of the Soviet Criminal Code, which penalizes "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda"—a catchall ban on saying, writing or disseminating anything critical of the government.

This was the technique the Kremlin used to crush the Helsinki monitoring group, founded in May 1976 in Moscow to foster compliance with the human-rights provisions of the Helsinki accord. Nine months later, two of its cofounders, Yuri Orlov, a physicist, and Alexander Ginzburg, a journalist, were arrested and charged with violating Article 70. By last year 34 group members had been arrested, and the group's remaining three members disbanded it.

Ginzburg was sent to ZhKh 385/1 in Mordovia. Released in April 1979, he now lives in Paris, where I interviewed him. "We cut and polished glass for chandeliers," he said. "The room was full of abrasive dust. Men spat blood and got silicosis." Their quota: 75 to 90 pieces a day each, far higher than the quota in a "free" factory. (The Department of Commerce says we import articles of glass from the Soviet Union, but is unable to confirm if this includes chandeliers.)

Orlov and other well-known members of the Helsinki monitoring group, such as Anatoly Shcharansky, are still at forced labor. Orlov works as a lathe operator in a camp set up in the Perm region, near the Ural Mountains. Shcharansky, despite falling eyesight, laboriously handweaves eight potato sacks a day in his dimly lit cell at Chistopol Prison 540 miles east of Moscow.

The tortures of hunger and cold drive many Gulag prisoners to desperation. Some chop off their own fingers to get hospitalized. Suicide is often a way out. One method is to race for the barbed wire in full view of a guard. MVD guards shoot to kill; they get an extra week of leave for bagging an escaping prisoner.

Bitter Fruits. Despite such blatant human-rights violations, we and other Western nations continue to buy the fruits of forced labor. Specifically, the United States in 1982 imported:

Chemicals, \$118-million worth, particularly anhydrous ammonia for fertilizer. Several Russian chemical plants are integral parts of industrial prison compounds.

Uranium, \$10-million worth. Uranium is mined by forced labor at Zheltyye Vody in the Ukraine. Exile sources add a Ukrainian camp at Novaya Borovaya, several Siberian camps at Krasnoyarsk, and another in Central Asia at Uchkuduk. Persistent rumors tell of uranium death camps where workers without protection from radiation last only a few months.

Gold, \$4.2-million worth. The CIA notes that forced laborers mine gold at Zeravshan in Central Asia. Exiles say convicts also mine or refine it in nearby Muruntau, and in Siberia at Bodaibo, Artemovsk, Talsheet and along the Yenisei River.

Wood and wood products, \$3.5-million worth. Logging and wood processing is done in some 350 camps in the Urals, the Northwest, the Volga-Vyatka and Siberia. Women fell trees around Kirov and Lake Baikal. Children from 14 to 18 make shipping cases at Novaya Lyalya in the Sverdlovsk region.

Tractors, \$500,000 worth. The main model imported by the United States is the Belarus, a light tractor. Parts are made at a Mordovian forced-labor camp.

"We'll Enforce It." Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is thus being largely ignored in Washington. Incredibly, I was unable to find a single official there concerned with trade who showed awareness of its relevance to our Russian imports.

Yet the law is clear. It provides that any citizen who suspects a violation can contact the Customs Service, which is required to open an investigation. If available information "reasonably" indicates a violation, the goods must be impounded. To have them released, the importer must produce a certificate from the foreign seller attesting that no forced labor was employed in any stage of production or any component of the merchandise.

Why doesn't the United States uphold the law? "The question of Soviet goods has just never come up," says a high Customs official in Washington. "But if some one shows us that Russian goods entering this country are made with forced labor, we'll enforce it."

Our allies in Europe import far more Russian goods than we do. Last year West Germany alone bought \$4.7-billion worth. French imports amounted to \$3.1 billion. The Siberian gas pipeline will raise these figures.

Few other countries have a law prohibiting importation of convict-made goods, but most Western nations are parties to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international treaties. They should join with the United States to raise this issue in the U.N.

The time has come to expose before the world Russia's economic exploitation of its citizens. But first we must ensure that our

own law, intended to prevent complicity in such barbarity, is enforced.

I have a report of a gentleman who served in a slave labor camp. I would like to submit this for the RECORD in complete detail, but let me state for the record: Let me read segments of this report. He said, "I, as a long-term prisoner of the Soviet gulag"—and let me say here one gentleman I met had been in the slave labor camp for 30 years, 30 years. He was an elderly man, and they allowed him to leave Russia because he would then be on their economy, he would require economic support from them. So they allowed him to come to our country because of pressure. But listen to this:

"I, as a long-term prisoner of the Soviet gulag, know that the labor of prisoners is used on a large scale in a whole series of concentration camps of the Soviet Government. These camps belong to the wood industry, extraction of useful industries, heavy chemical and wood pulp industries, light industry, the food industry." He goes on to say, "Research center for prisons, psycho-prisons, and concentration camps of the U.S.S.R. published in Abraham Shifrin's 'Guide to Camps and Prisons of the U.S.S.R.,' thus most of the wood-finishing industries uses raw materials used by slave labor." That is this babushka doll. "In the woodworking industry they also use slave labor. The Soviet economy uses prisoners in the mining/ore industry, in both pits and mines, and they extract coal, gold, uranium, copper, chromium, nickel, molybdenum, and diamonds. I personally worked in a gold mine." He says the extraction of diamonds also uses slave labor. He goes on to mention all the camps, and then he says something which I think is particularly moving: "Odessa Prison (290059, Odessa-59) Establishment YuG-311/76 where there are women's and children's camps. The women work in the textile mill, and the children make consumer metal products." I will submit this entire report for the RECORD.

UTILIZATION OF SLAVE LABOR—EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY

(By S. Karavans'kii)

INTRODUCTION

I as a long-term prisoner of the Soviet Gulag (concentration camp system), know that the labor of prisoners is used on a large scale in a whole series of concentration camps of the Soviet government. These camps belong to the: 1. Wood Industry; 2. Extraction of Useful Minerals; 3. Heavy, Chemical, and Wood Pulp Industries; 4. Light Industry; 5. Food Industry.

In addition to my own observations, this article employs the testimony of other former concentration-camp prisoners, as well as materials of the Research Center for Prisons, Psychoprison, and Concentration Camps of the U.S.S.R., published in Abraham Shifrin's Guide to Camps and Prisons of the USSR. The source of information or the name of the witness is given for each specific piece of testimony. All addresses, what-

ever the source, have been verified and corrected on the basis of the publication, List of Political Prisoners of the USSR (No. 5, situation as of January 5, 1983).

I. The wood industry

The Soviet wood industry has used and still uses slave labor for felling timber. I, myself, felled timber in Irkutsk Province (Oblast') in the following camps of the Ozerlag: Camp 307, Irkutsk Province, Bratsk District (Rayon), Anzheba settlement, establishment UK-272/307; Camp 018, Irkutsk Province, Vikhorevka settlement, establishment UK-272/018; Camps 041 and 034. From the accounts of prisoners, I know that of the lumber camps in the USSR, the prisoners still work in the following camps: Kitoilag, Irkutsk Province; Ust'-Vymag, Komi Autonomous Republic; Dubrovlag, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic; Sevurallag,¹ Ivdel'lag, Sverdlovsk Province; Viatlag, Kirov Province; Kraslag, Krasnoyarsk Territory (Kray); Oneglag; Kargopol'lag; Sol'lag, Arkhangelsk Province. A large quantity of lumber is exported from these regions of the USSR to the free world. There are scores of witnesses to the existence of these camps. Here is some of the testimony: N. Akhmetov's and V. Mikhaleiko's list of prisoners, dated 1978, and the address of Camp No. 16 of Kraslag, which produces lumber for export were published on pp. 151-52 of the journal *Kontinent* (No. 24, 1980). The address of Camp No. 16 is Krasnoyarsk Territory, Uyar District, Gromadskaya Station, establishment UP-288/16.

Thus, most of the wood-finishing industry uses raw materials produced by slave labor. We must include here the furniture industry, the building materials industry, the paper industry, the wood-pulp (cellulose) industry, and a major part of the chemical industry, as well as the construction industry.

In the wood-working industry they also use slave labor. I personally worked in Camp 019 of the Ozerlag, which served the great wood-working combine in Irkutsk Province, Chuna District, Chuna Station, Establishment UK-272/019; then in Camp 025 of the Ozerlag camps, Irkutsk Province, Tayshet District, Tayshet city, Establishment UK-272/025, and in Camp No. 11 of the Dubrovlag (Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Zubova Polyana District, Yavas Settlement, Establishment ZhKh-305/11, in the furniture factory.

From the evidence of long-term prisoners, taken down by the Prisons Research Center, we have the following examples: south of Syktyvkar in the Kobra Camp, with a population of 2,000, they made plywood for export. In Bekabad, Uzbek Republic, in Camp 64/21, 1,600 prisoners work in the wood-processing plant, which makes boards. Address: Uzbek Republic, Tashkent Province, city of Bekabad, Establishment UY-64/21.

In Vologda, there are two camps with 2,500 prisoners each, which provide the work force for the plywood factory and the wood-processing plant.

Testimony of the Prisons Research Center: Abraham Shifrin (Israel).

¹ Translator's note. "lag" means "lager" or "camp, concentration camp." The designations ending in "lag" (Dubrovlag) stand for a series of camps under that administration. The first part of the word stands for a town or region, e.g., Sevurallag—Northern Ural Camps; Dubrovlag—Dubrovki (town of) camps. For administrative units, I have translated Oblast' as Province, Rayon as District, Kray as Territory. I have guessed the abbreviation "uchr" to be "uchrezhdenie," i.e., establishment.

II. Extraction of useful minerals

The Soviet economy uses prisoners in the mining/ore industry, in both pits and mines, and they extract coal, gold, uranium, copper, chromium, nickel, molybdenum, and diamonds.

I personally worked at the Matrosov gold mine. Address: Magadan Province, Ten'gi District, Matrosov Settlement, Establishment 261/1. This campsite is part of the Berlag, which has about 50 camps. Besides Berlag, the Maglag, which also has 50 camps, extracts gold. At the Matrosov camp they extract gold ore, which then is enriched at the Matrosov Enrichment Plant. At present, the Matrosov mine is not using prison labor, but in Magadan Province and elsewhere prisoners work in the gold mines of Yagodnoye, Susman, Orotukan, Palattsy, Vetreynyi, Budennyi, Timoshenko, and other places. Besides mine, there is the testimony of Mys'o (USA).

Gold for the national treasury of the USSR is extracted at Bodaybo, Irkutsk Province, and the prisoners who work the gold mines are situated in three camps. Testimony of A. Shifrin (Israel).

The extraction of diamonds also uses slave labor. In the center of diamond mining, at the town of Mirnoye, Tyumen' Province, there are no camps, but the polishing of the diamonds is left to prisoners. In Solekhard, Tyumen' Province, there are two camps with 2,500 prisoners each, in which diamonds intended for export to "Russian Gems" stores are polished by prisoners. Testimony of A. Shifrin.

Prison labor is employed in molybdenum, manganese, chromium, nickel (Noril'sk, Krasnoyarsk Territory) and uranium mines in rich sites and even in the Ukraine at Rakhov.

In the southern part of the Komi Autonomous Republic, in the Vorkutlag and Rachlag (Inta) systems, prisoners extract coal. Individual mines where prisoners work are scattered over the whole of the U.S.S.R. For example, according to the Prisons Research Center data: Chernogorsk, Krasnoyarsk Territory. About 6,000 prisoners work in the coal mines; Temir-Tau, Kemerovo Province. 800 prisoners extract coal; Shakhty, Rostov Province, 1,500 prisoners work in coal mines. Address: Rostov Province, city of Novoshakhtinsk, Establishment UCh-398/11.

According to the data of the Prisons Research Center, prisoners work in the gas and petroleum extraction industry in the following places in the U.S.S.R. Apsheronsk Station, Khadyzhensk, Neftegorsk, Krasnoyarsk Territory. The villages of Negotka, Parabel', and Kolpashevo, Tyumen' Province, 4,000 prisoners. The towns of Serafimovich, Vologda Province; Krasnyy Khuduk, Seroglazovka, Dosang, Astrakhan Province; Krasnovodsk, Cheleken, Nebit-Dag, Turkmen Republic; Shchekino and Lipki, Tula Province, 3,000 prisoners work gas deposits at bore holes. In Kitsan, Moldavian Republic, 1,000 prisoners quarry marble. Testimony of the Prisons Research Center, A. Shifrin (Israel).

III. The heavy, chemical, and wood pulp industries

Slave labor is very suitable in the Soviet system of economic exploitation for conducting work-site operations in heavy industry. For example, prisoners assemble radiators for the "Moskvich" automobile factory in Moscow, according to inmates at the Tenth Dubrovlag camp, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Zubova Polyana District, Es-

tablishment ZhKh-385/10. Testimony of S. Karavans'kii (USA).

Besides, I know that in Lviv on Stryi Street, there is Camp No. 48 (Lviv, Establishment VL-315/48), where the prisoners make motorized agricultural machines. The Prisons Research Center also has data on the following camps: Camp 62/4, city of Gorky, Establishment UZ-62/4. Prisoners work in the unhealthy paint shop of the automobile plant. Camp 62/12 Gorky Province, city of Bor, Establishment UZ-62/12. Prisoners work in a plastics and glass factory; Camp 154/12, Vologda Province, city of Volzhskii, Establishment YaR-154/12. 1,200 prisoners work in the tractor plant; Camp 15/2, Byelorussian Republic, city of Bobruyski, Establishment 15/2. 1,000 prisoners work at the rubber-tire plant; Minsk, Mogilev Highway. Near the automobile plant "Severnyi Poselok" (North Settlement) there is a new prison for women, who work at the Minsk Automobile Factory; Camp 48/9, Chelyabinsk Province, city of Bakal, Establishment YaV-48/9. 1,300 prisoners work at the metal-working shop; Soroka, Moldavian Republic. 1,000 prisoners make superphosphates; Novaya Lyalya, Sverdlovsk Province. 1,000 prisoners from Camp UShch-349/41 work at the paper mill. Evidence of the Prisons Research Center: A. Shifrin (Israel).

IV. Light industry

Prison labor is used readily in light industry, which makes consumer goods. I worked in Camp 385/1, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Zubova Polyana District, Sosnovka Station, Establishment MZh-385-1. There was a polishing shop, where they polished glass parts (hangers) for electric mirrors. Political prisoners worked here. This shop still exists. Live-in prisoners work here. I also worked at the furniture factory at Camp 385/11, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Zubova Polyana District, Yavas Station, Establishment ZhKh-385/11. The factory is still operational and prisoners work there. At Yavas Station, I also worked in a garment factory in Camp 385/4, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Yavas Station, Establishment ZhKh-385/4. Women prisoners also worked there, making uniforms for the militia, railroad workers, etc.

In Women's Camp 385/3, for women political prisoners, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Ten'gi District, Barashevo Station, Establishment ZhKh-385/3, the women made gloves, which were then sold as specialties in all of the USSR. Testimony of N. Strokata (USA). This witness testifies to the existence of a women's camp at Rostov, Rostov Province, Tunnel'skaya ulitsa (Tunnel Street), Establishment 398/19, where women work in a packing plant.

From the testimony of prisoners whom I met at a stopover, I know that in Camp 385/19, Mordvidian Autonomous Republic, Zubova Polyana District, settlement of Lesnoye, Establishment ZhKh-385/19, the prisoners make and polish watch casings ordered by the Sverdlovsk Clock Factory. The products of this factory are exported to England. The witnesses to this are the prisoner Yu. Vudka (Israel), K. Lyubars'kii (Munich), and M. Budulak-Sharygin (England).

In the city of Vladimir, Camp No. 2, city of Vladimir, Establishment Od-1/St-2) the prisoners worked and still work in the rooms where they sleep and eat, assembling triodes and resistors (radio parts) for the Second Moscow Radio Plant. Besides, in this prison, the prisoners make (Stamp out) zippers and electronic parts. Witness: S. Karavans'kii

(USA). From the testimony of prisoners, I know of the following: *Chistopol' Prison* (422950, Tatar Autonomous Republic, city of Chistopol', Establishment UZ-148/4), where the prisoners make wrist watches and alarm clocks in the rooms in which they live.

Odessa Prison (290059, Odessa-59, Establishment YuG-311/76, where there are women's and children's camps. The women work in the textile mill and the children make consumer metal products.

Lviv, Shevchenko Street. There is Camp VL-315/30 in which 1,500 prisoners work at the furniture factory.

From the materials of the Prisons Research Center, we know of the following:

Leningrad. Inmates from the prison work at the cardboard factory that produces boxes for the shoe firm "Skorokhod" (Fast Walker) on the Arsenal Embankment (Arsenal'skaya Naberezhnaya). Address of the prison: Leningrad, IZ-45/1.

Leningrad Province. In the Metallostroy (Metal Construction) Camp, prisoners make door locks and mattress springs; in the Ul'yanovka and Volkhov camps, 1,200 men and 1,500 women work in the garment factories.

Minsk. Near the bus stop "Protezhnyi Zavod" (Prosthetics Factory), there is a camp of 3,000 persons who work in the furniture factories.

Bobruysk, Byelorussian Republic. On Bokhorevskaya Street there is a children's colony that makes furniture and cardboard packing cases.

Orsha, Byelorussian Republic. There are two camps: UZh-15/12 and UZh-15/6 where the prisoners make metal spoons, knives, and forks.

Irpen', near Kiev. The camp makes radio parts. 2,000 prisoners.

Korosten', Ukraine. 2,000 prisoners make furniture and electrical apparatus.

Nizhni Tagil, Sverdlovsk Province. 300 prisoners in camp UZhch-349/13 make consumer goods: locks, mattresses.

Beyuk Shor, Azerbaidzan Republic. In Camp UA-38, 300 prisoners make inlaid products as well as miniature casings for jewelers' goods, and the parlor game "Shesh-besh," which is for export.

Achinsk, Krasnoyarsk Territory. 1,000 women prisoners work in the garment factory.

Ul'yanovsk, 600 women in Camp YuI-78/2 make ferrite cells for the computer factory. Novyi Oskol, Belgorod Province. 1,000 women prisoners in Camp YuS-321/4 work in a textile mill.

Novokuznetsk, Kemerovo Province. 1,000 women work in a knit-goods factory.

Garku, near Tallin, Estonia. 300 women prisoners make buttons.

Rzhev, Kalinin Province. 500 inmates in a high-security (severe discipline) prison assemble electric switches in the rooms in which they live.

Evidence of the Prisons Research Center: A. Shifrin.

V. Food industry

Shikotan Island, Kurile Islands. 6,000 women prisoners work in a cannery that makes preserves and packs red caviar.

Testimony: A. Shifrin (Israel).

Now, what does the law say? The law says, "All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be en-

titled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited."

I tell the people in Treasury Department that it is prohibited. The regulations say clearly this, that if the Commissioner of Customs finds at any time that information available reasonably but not conclusively indicates it, they must prohibit. Reasonably, not conclusively.

We have talked to people, tractor generators, wood products, babushka dolls coming in from the Soviet Union made on the backs of slave labor, political dissidents, Christians, Jews, people who want freedom, and yet we are still allowing that into this country.

Mr. Speaker, the provision that we have in this law would require Customs people and the people at the Department of Treasury to prohibit these goods from coming in. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will do it. It is a crime and a blot and a moral crime that we have not done it.

I am pleased with the support of the committee, Mr. Hoyer and the others, and of course the chairman and so many others on the Senate side. This was unanimous in our conference that with this language we can do it.

The pertinent statute and regulations follow:

I. STATUTE

Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) provides as follows:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision. The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on January 1, 1931; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States.

"Forced labor," as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily.

II. REGULATIONS

19 CFR 12.42(e)

"If the Commissioner of Customs finds at any time that information available reasonably but not conclusively indicates that merchandise within the purview of 307 is being or is likely to be imported he will promptly advise all district directors accordingly and the district directors shall withhold release of any such merchandise pending further instructions."

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3036, the conference report on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

I first want to applaud my chairman, Mr. ROYBAL, for his able leadership and also the ranking member, Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico, for his help on the subcommittee, and every member of the subcommittee.

I look upon the committee as being a great help to the people of our country as they responsibly legislate, as we did on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support because the committee has looked at the dire needs of our country in all the areas under its jurisdiction and has done a good job, a responsible job, in seeing that appropriations are proper.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 5798, the Treasury, Postal Service, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986.

First, let me commend the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. ROYBAL, and our ranking member, Mr. SKEEN, for all their hard work on the bill we have before us today. Few Members are aware of the many hours of work and the countless hearings that have been devoted to preparing this bill. I am proud to be a member of this subcommittee, and I thank my fellow members of the subcommittee and our staff for all their hard work.

The bill we have before us today is a good bill that every Member of the House should support. It contains funding for many essential operations of Government, most notably, the Treasury Department and the Executive Office of the President. One item in the Treasury Department that I want to note is a staffing increase for the Customs Service. This staffing increase is long overdue. For years, the Customs Service has been functioning at pre-1980 staffing levels. We all know that the Customs Service is on the battle line when it comes to fighting drugs.

Mr. Speaker, funding for the Customs Service is just one of the thoughtful actions our subcommittee has taken while still presenting to you a bill that is fiscally responsible.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman ROYBAL for his leadership on this legislation and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

□ 1050

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], the watchdog of the budget.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I am responding to some comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, a member of the subcommittee, Congressman WOLF. I intend later in the proceedings to make a point of

order against the amendment that the gentleman from Virginia was talking about and which he has had such a strong position in promoting. In my judgment, his work has been not only effective, but meritorious, because he makes a good point.

In making my point of order, I do so with some trepidation. I do it, however, at the request of the Department of the Treasury, which is charged with carrying out the intention of the basic law to which the gentleman from Virginia referred.

The Department and I are in a difficult position on this matter. We know that there is slave labor in the U.S.S.R. and we do not want to stand in the way of enforcing any of our laws or even other efforts to identify and to try to stop the use of slave labor. There is already in this bill, I might note, a provision directing enforcement of that law, and I think it is a good provision and I believe that the Treasury is going to do its dead-level best to carry it out.

The amendment, however, is a forcing amendment. It takes a list devised by the Commissioner of Customs in 1981—and I would stipulate the babushka dolls are not on it—and says we can accept no more of those after December 31 except in the case of conclusive showing that they are not produced by slave labor. That reverses the normal evidentiary test and it seems to me is too strong and too forcing a statement.

When the Commissioner of Customs wanted to enforce this list a couple of years ago, the Secretary of the Treasury consulted with the CIA, and CIA Director Casey subsequently directed two letters to then Secretary Regan, one on the 16th of May, 1984, and one on the 17th of January, 1985. I would like to insert them in the record, but before so doing, I would simply note that the CIA finds extensive use of slave labor, but Mr. Casey says in letter No. 1:

Accordingly, I have to advise you that the Agency's information, while convincing as to the policy and practices . . . with respect to forced labor, could not now be provided with sufficient precision to have probative value in a legal proceeding with respect to a particular product. You can be assured that we will continue our work . . .

The 17th of January letter follows that up, following a report from the ITC, which supported the finding of the first letter, indicating that the CIA will continue to keep working on the matter.

The full text of the letters follows:

THE DIRECTOR OF
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, May 16, 1984.

Hon. DONALD T. REGAN,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: This letter is written in connection with your statutory responsibilities to prevent the entry into the United States of

foreign goods which are produced by convict, forced or indentured labor. We have a good deal of information that the Soviet Union makes extensive use of such labor. We estimate that there are approximately 2 million forced laborers in camps. An additional 2 million or so forced laborers are not confined and are mostly involved in construction.

We have in the past at the request of the Commissioner of Customs furnished information concerning the production of goods with forced labor in the Soviet Union. Although there is convincing evidence that convict and forced labor is used extensively in the Soviet Union, it is fragmentary with respect to specific products. Our information does not enable us to estimate the proportion of total Soviet production of individual products which comes from forced labor. Nor is our information sufficiently precise to allow us to determine whether and to what extent the products of forced labor are exported to the United States.

I am also concerned that the need to make such evidence as we have publicly available, as would almost certainly be necessary for you to carry out your responsibilities, would endanger intelligence sources and methods.

Accordingly, I have to advise you that the Agency's information, while convincing as to the policy and practices of the Soviet Union with respect to forced labor, could not now be provided with sufficient precision to have probative value in a legal proceeding with respect to a particular product. You can be assured that we will continue our work in this area and will keep your Department currently advised if we are able to develop more satisfactory and precise evidence that might be helpful in preventing the entry into the United States of goods produced by convict, forced labor, or indentured labor.

Yours,

WILLIAM J. CASEY.

THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL
INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, January 17, 1985.

Hon. DONALD T. REGAN,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC, 20220

DEAR DON: In the wake of the release of the ITC report on the use of forced labor in foreign countries to produce goods for export, I thought I should write you to update the status of our research on this issue. Despite continued monitoring, we are unable to obtain sufficient facts to make a solid case that any particular good we receive from the USSR is produced by convict, forced, or indentured labor.

You will recall that on 16 May I sent you a letter which stated that according to our most recent analysis 3 percent of total Soviet labor is forced. That analysis remains valid, but I can find nothing in the ITC report that indicates the availability of more specific data.

Yours,

WILLIAM J. CASEY.

The trouble, also, with the amendment is that if the Treasury were not to go forward as forced, the entire department or subdepartment on which we rely to do the work to carry out this section of the law would literally be repealed.

I have discussed this matter at length with the Treasury. Those who purport to speak for the Secretary tell

me that he expects to work harder on this program and hopes to have some action within the first half of the next year. I cannot guarantee that anymore than they can, but I believe it is their intention to try to act under section 307 and enforce the law, lay it on them. The word I get from them is that they have received the message that Congressman WOLF, Congressman HOYER and many others have effectively carried. Treasury knows it is on borrowed time and I think does fully intend to carry out the law.

In the meantime, however, the amendment, in my judgment, is too harsh. I understand and sympathize with the frustration of Congressman WOLF and his supporters. I do not blame them. I do, however, invite the House's attention to the timing of the situation which will soon occur, and it would seem that if we are going to take strong action against the U.S.S.R. in any area, we ought to be on most solid ground before we do so and have a strongly provable case.

If my point of order is sustained, I believe that Congressman WOLF, Congressman HOYER and others will still have done the job in demanding the Treasury begin to enforce this law, and I think they will be successful.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am grievously concerned about the appropriations in this measure as they affect the Internal Revenue Service. All of us know that we have faced a crisis in this country during the past year with respect to the Internal Revenue Service. In city after city we have been holding special hearings of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, trying to find out some way to shore up the weak spots in the performance of the Internal Revenue Service.

All through the year, we have kept in close touch with the Appropriations Committee in an effort to get added funds for the Internal Revenue Service. I pay my respects to Chairman ROYBAL and his committee because it kept us from making the cuts earlier called for by the administration. And on the surface of this bill, it looks like we are getting an additional \$176 million for Internal Revenue Service. I am advised, though, that that is not so, and that actually we will only be getting about \$76 million, because we are losing about \$100 million, just to avoid a 5 percent pay cut for all Internal Revenue Service personnel. If that is so, I am informed that the Internal Revenue Service will be in a position where it will lose some 600 people. Now, if that is the case, we should be providing more funding for the IRS. We ought to be adding 600 or 1,200 people, or more, across this land instead of cutting 600.

Now, the Internal Revenue Service may have the choice of either hiring people or spending money on equipment. But it is a cruel choice if the Service is put in that position. If, in fact, this conference report does put the Internal Revenue Service in that position, it would seem to me that we ought to ask for some kind of supplemental report later. We simply cannot decimate the ranks of the Internal Revenue Service and hope to collect the revenue needed to maintain our Federal Government. The Internal Revenue Service is the only agency of Government other than the Customs Service that raises any money for us. And yet, if we turn around and cut its resources, then we have decimated the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to serve its purpose.

I am grieved that the Internal Revenue Service has not brought this to our attention. All through the year, we tried to ask them, "Do you need more help?" and they stonewalled it down there just because the OMB said, "Well, we have got to make this 5-percent cut." Then they send up their revised request after the House has already made its appropriation decision.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I want to advise the gentleman that it is no different than what the administration has done with Customs every year since I have been in the Congress. They did exactly the same thing with IRS.

Let me read you some numbers real quick. The administration had originally proposed to cut 1,254 positions from the IRS, and the problem with any committee in the Congress that tries to turn that around is that you start not from zero in trying to help IRS or any other agency, you start, in this case, from a minus 1,254, not zero, because that was the administration's request.

Let me tell you, though, that the funding level in the conference agreement provides for 1,800 additional IRS staff positions. The administration has indicated it will accept now the increased IRS staffing level.

I just want to advise the gentleman of that fact. We are not happy with the overall allocation of dollars, but we had to compromise with the other body on that issue.

Mr. PICKLE. But the net of it is, although you may add some extra funds, about all you are doing is you are just treading water, you are hoping to keep even from last year.

Now, I am just saying if the net effect of it is that we are going to end up cutting the Internal Revenue Service by over 600 people, then that cannot be accepted; and some way or

another, we have got to ask for supplemental funds later or else everybody in Government will have to recognize that the Internal Revenue Service does not have the personnel to do the job, and we will not have the money to run the Government.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I want to try to assure the gentleman we added 600, we did not cut 600.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would like to ask the chairman a question.

In regard to this same discussion that we have been having that the gentleman from Texas alluded to, Mr. Chairman, I know that we added some \$76 million to the IRS budget, and it was our understanding, I think, on the committee, that that was for personnel. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROYBAL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SKEEN. I have some quarrel with the administration, too, or with the Department. And we come back to now, the IRS is telling us there is some \$42 million they have discovered. They are a big agency. They have discovered that out of that \$76 million increase, some \$42 million could necessarily have to go to mandatory add-on costs, such as cost increases, postage, rent, and so on. That was not our intent. If they wanted that, they should have come to us with a budget requesting that. I appreciate the chairman's response, because we were trying to strengthen IRS. It is ridiculous leaving \$80 billion on the table now because we do not have enough people to do the audits and enough equipment.

Mr. PICKLE. If the gentleman will yield, I respect the Appropriations Committee for your efforts, because you have tried to get funds, but because of the action of OMB, we are ending up now with almost a minus-personnel Internal Revenue Service. When you have these big snafus over the country, the Congress ought to remember that we just do not have the trained personnel to carry out our functions, and that ought to be embarrassing for all of us.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this particular bill is \$951 million over the President's budget request, it is \$48 million over last year, it is \$289 million over the congressional budget conference report. It is my understanding, having just spoken to a representative of the administration, that they are threatening to veto this bill.

I think that Members ought to be advised that this is a bill that probably will be vetoed and, at least in the opinion of this Member, it should be vetoed in large part because the spending is far too high.

I think that at a time when we are out here posturing on questions of spending that it is high time that we begin to rein ourselves in. Here is a good place to start.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I appreciate the gentleman finding all of this information out, and I also appreciate him bringing it down here to us, and so forth. But we have been threatened with a veto every day we have been in here. I would like to ask the gentleman, how much is the discretionary spending in this bill now under what it was last year?

Mr. WALKER. My understanding is that this is \$48 million over last year's expenditures.

Mr. SKEEN. On the discretionary. These are mandatory. What is the discretionary?

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentleman that I, for one, am concerned about the broad base of the spending.

Mr. SKEEN. We are all concerned. Will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I am concerned about the fact that we have \$48 million more than last year.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 3036 and I want to congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. ROYBAL, and our ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, for the fine work and leadership they have contributed in drafting this report.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee went to conference with the realities of the massive budget deficits of the last 5 years. We also kept in mind the continued influx of illegal narcotics, contraband, and unreported imports which costs the Nation both lives and revenue. In this vein, the conference committee reported a bill which provides for 623 new Customs personnel to protect our borders from the illegal flow of drugs and imports. These increases will also provide increased revenue for the Nation's Treasury through better enforcement of our trade laws. For every dollar we spend on Customs, we receive \$20 in return through increased enforcement of our

trade laws, and this bill will help achieve this goal.

This bill turns the tide of the last 4 years in which this Nation has let its defenses down along our borders. Every year I have served in this Congress, the administration, as usual, has proposed gutting the Customs Service out some false sense of economy and efficiency. And every year, the Congress has fought to maintain the current years' level. This year, the administration proposed cutting the Customs Service by an additional 887 positions. But this year the Congress not only said no, the Congress said what the Customs Service needed was not less but more to do its job. I realize we are in a time when we must try and do more with less, but in the case of controlling imports and stopping drugs, this is just false economics. Therefore, the committee and the Congress not only restored the 887 positions Reagan cut, but we added an additional 623. This amount is below the House passed level of 800, which I would have preferred, but it represents the middle ground between the House and Senate, and clearly it is a reversal of the previous policy of defeat along our borders.

The bill also contains a provision which places a floor on the amount of Customs personnel which must be hired in fiscal year 1986. In the past, the Congress has approved funding for a specific number of personnel and yet the Customs Service has hired less than that number. In most cases, the Customs Services has been from 300 to 500 positions below the amount mandated by Congress. The Office of Management and Budget often instructs Customs and other agencies to ignore Congress' intentions. To do so again will be a violation of the law.

The bill also includes a provision which prohibits the use of any funds to close or consolidate any region, district, or port, or any duty assessment or appraisal center of the Customs Service. The Customs Service has continued its efforts to reduce and consolidate the number of districts and ports in every part of the Nation, but has never adequately informed Congress what its long range plans are and specifically which areas will be affected in these reductions. In lieu of such a plan therefore, the committee saw no other alternative but to prohibit any such activity until the Customs Service properly comes before the Congress with its proposals.

The conference also addressed the hard choice of revenue forgone for the Postal Service. Many worthwhile groups and organizations such as the blind, the American Cancer Society, and veterans organizations receive a subsidized mail rate through the revenue forgone appropriation. The administration sought no funding for the program in fiscal year 1986. The

House approved full funding at \$960 million. The House conferees, although strong supporters of the program, realized the need for deficit reduction in every account, and therefore agreed to compromise with the Senate, providing \$820.1 million.

The committee also sought to provide the necessary funds for the Internal Revenue Service, which as we all know has been plagued this year will lack of adequate resources to process tax returns causing unprecedented backlogs and delays. The conference agreed to a figure of \$3.7 billion for the IRS, \$1.9 million less than the House figure, and \$75.9 million more than the Senate. This amount was supported by the IRS and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the bill the conference committee sought to stay as close to the House-passed figures as possible while providing for economy and efficiency, as well as giving the agencies under our jurisdiction the tools to do the jobs entrusted to them. We are under the House-passed bill by \$83.5 million our 302(b) budget allocation by \$324 million. This is a good bill and should be adopted by the House.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for the excellent work that he does on the committee. He is a new member of the committee but is definitely doing a most excellent job.

I would also like to thank all of the members of the committee. They are most dedicated. They are always present. They always participate. Without them, of course, we would not be bringing to this House a conference report that I believe is a very excellent one and one that has not had anyone asking to dissent in any way, that is, members of the committee.

But I would like to thank still another gentleman of that committee, and that is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who is probably the most knowledgeable member of the Committee on Appropriations, for his advice and the excellent work that he does and the help that he has given me and the members of the committee.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Treasury Department appropriations conference agreement, and specifically the provisions which call upon the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations to bar the importation of goods produced in the Soviet Union by convict, indentured, or forced labor.

While the Trade Act of 1930 makes it clear that the United States should have no part whatsoever in encouraging or subsidizing forced labor, a 1983 Central Intelligence study compiled a list of over three

dozen products made by forced labor for export.

Based on the evidence available, the Customs Service recommended to the Secretary of the Treasury in late 1983 that a ban on Soviet slave labor products be enforced. Yet, despite the Tariff Act, and the evidence of the use of forced labor in the Soviet Union, the Treasury Department has continued to allow slave labor products to enter this country.

In the past, this body has let it be known that it desires compliance with previously enacted slave labor policies. I am therefore encouraged that this legislation includes strong provisions which will direct the Department of Treasury to enforce this ban.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this conference report. Though the funding is above the President's request, the difference lies mainly in three important areas that I believe need the level set by the conferees.

While the Congress is debating trade and tax reform, the administration is requesting inadequate funding for both the IRS and the Customs Service. A report just this week indicated that voluntary tax compliance is down. While this is surely due in part to frustration with the current code, it occurs to me that it just might also be because enforcement is being neglected. In fact, the administration had proposed to cut over 1,000 positions from the IRS. This report provides for 1,800 additional IRS staff positions. The first step toward a fair tax is one that is equally enforced and that can only be accomplished with adequate staff.

The same can be said for the Customs Service. The administration has repeatedly told us existing trade laws can address the threat of imports. Americans, particularly in the textile industry in my district, are losing jobs because imports are pouring in. The House has passed legislation to protect these jobs, but the administration opposes that effort saying agreements are already in place. Those agreements are meaningless if they are not enforced and they cannot be enforced without Customs Service personnel. This administration had proposed a cut of 887 positions. That prospect is staggering. The Government Operations Committee has reviewed the enforcement of textile and apparel import quotas and has found that, despite an elaborate system of international agreements, the U.S. has failed to prevent import disruption of its domestic markets. Further, we have failed to stop the evasion of those agreements. Because of increasing workloads and staff shortages, the Service is unable to prevent violations of the restraint system causing serious injury to the domestic textile industry. We need to increase, not decrease, our Customs Service staff. They produce revenue, \$21.06 for every appropriated dollar in 1984. I'm extremely pleased that this report provides 473 positions, bringing the total to over 14,000.

I urge the adoption of the report and would call on the President to see the consistency of his policies in it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the conferees of the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate for including language in their report on Treasury, Postal Service and general Government appropriations indicating to the Customs Service that additional customs positions should be assigned to the San Francisco district. Under the leadership of Representative ROYBAL and Senator ABDNOR, the conference committee took an important step in helping the bay area customs office obtain some of the additional staff positions which they so desperately need to keep up with the ever-increasing amounts of customs work in the area. I appreciate my colleagues' help.

I would like to urge the Customs Service to follow the suggestion of the appropriations conferees and assign sufficient additional staffers to satisfy the needs of the bay area customs office.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

When an appropriations bill goes to conference, it is understood that some compromise must be made. This conference, however, appears to have caved in completely. The House bill was at \$13.2 billion. The Senate bill was at \$12.9 billion. Conferees bravely agreed to hold the line at a full \$13.2 billion.

Even the House's one money-saving provision, a modest reduction of 2.65 percent from a few programs aimed at coming close to the House budget target, fell by the wayside in conference. The only savings contained in this report is a 14-percent cut in the Postal Service's Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, our budget crisis is real. We can no longer accept loose controls on spending such as those contained in this report. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the conference report on H.R. 3036.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the best ways to reduce the Federal deficit is to collect taxes owed. Yet, the administration's current policy of cutting funds for Internal Revenue Service and Customs Service enforcement and collection would stand this truism on its head.

The IRS recently reported \$8.5 billion in active delinquent accounts, with accounts receivable totaling \$30 billion. Altogether we face a tax gap of some \$90 billion this year, an amount representing the total of uncollected revenues from only legitimate businesses.

When the IRS spends a buck on tax enforcement, it gets 5 in return. Nonetheless, in a time of \$200 billion deficits and nearly half that in uncollected revenues, the White House proposed to cut the IRS work force by 1,254 positions. Fortunately, the conferees on the Treasury appropriations bill have rejected this upside-down logic and increased IRS and Customs staff by about 1,800 and 600 workers, respectively.

A recent Government Operations Subcommittee investigation by our colleague, Representative DOUG BARNARD, showed why weaker IRS enforcement is not only bad tax policy but an invitation for more "dirty money" laundering and drug deal-

ing, too. I include an article on this study and urge my colleagues to support fair and effective enforcement by the IRS. Our law-abiding taxpayers deserve no less. (Article follows from the November 5, 1985 Washington Post.)

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1985]

IRS SEEN AS LAX ON CASH TRANSFERS

(By Kathy Sawyer)

In the world of "dirty money," "public attention has focused on the need for better policing of big banks. Now congressional investigators are looking at another villain—The Internal Revenue Service.

The Treasury Department has fined six banks this year for failure to fulfill reporting requirements that could tip authorities to large-scale money laundering linked to drug trafficking and other crimes.

But House investigators now say one of Treasury's own—the IRS—has left open a convenient secondary money-laundering route and has failed to use its legal authority to develop criminal investigations in the area.

Under the Bank Secrecy Act, the IRS is responsible for assuring that thousands of "secondary financial institutions"—such as check-cashing facilities, finance companies and precious metal or coin dealers—report all transactions of more than \$10,000.

But the agency "continues to devote grossly insufficient resources" to the task "and its efforts lack coordination and consistency," Rep. Doug Barnard, Jr. (D-GA.), a Government Operations subcommittee chairman, wrote to IRS Commissioner Roscoe L. Egger, Jr.

"At the current level of resources and commitment, the currency transactions reporting program cannot succeed in meeting its intended purposes of detecting criminal activity and unreported income in the underground economy," Barnard said in an Oct. 25 letter.

Subcommittee investigators found that by December 1984, the IRS had identified only 3,014 of an estimated 15,000 businesses involved in such transactions.

They also found that the agency conducted only 644 compliance checks at such businesses in 1984, less than one-third the number made in 1981.

Accurate reports on large cash transactions can be useful in criminal investigations—as demonstrated by a 1982 internal IRS audit obtained by the subcommittee, an investigator said.

In samplings of two IRS districts—Cincinnati and Louisville—where about 5,000 currency transaction reports were filed from 1976 to 1980, the report found 42 persons involved in three or more transactions. Of these, 10 individuals involved in 57 transactions totaling \$1.3 million had no record of ever filing tax returns.

One individual who had filed a tax return in 1980 had 27 currency transactions in 1980 totaling \$1.2 million, yet had reported an adjusted gross income of only \$2,295. This person also had a number of large transactions in 1978 and reported a small income then. For others with large transactions reported income of less than \$10,000 on their 1980 tax returns.

Five in the group had criminal records and two were under investigation for narcotics violations. But officials had made no use or minimal use of the transaction reports to develop criminal investigations, auditors found.

The IRS declined immediate comment but said Egger will reply directly to Barnard.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). All time has expired.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 171, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—237

Ackerman	Dyson	Lowery (CA)
Akaka	Early	Lowry (WA)
Alexander	Edgar	Lundine
Anderson	Edwards (CA)	Manton
Andrews	English	Markey
Annunzio	Evans (IL)	Martinez
Aspin	Fascell	Matsui
Atkins	Fazio	Mavroules
Barnes	Flippo	Mazzoli
Bateman	Florio	McCloskey
Bates	Foglietta	McCurdy
Bedell	Foley	McDade
Belenson	Ford (MI)	McGrath
Berman	Ford (TN)	McHugh
Bevill	Frank	Mica
Blaggi	Frost	Mikulski
Boehlert	Gaydos	Miller (CA)
Boggs	Gejdenson	Miller (WA)
Boland	Gephardt	Mineta
Boner (TN)	Gilman	Mitchell
Bonior (MI)	Gonzalez	Moakley
Bonker	Gordon	Mollinari
Borski	Gray (IL)	Mollohan
Bosco	Gray (PA)	Morrison (CT)
Boucher	Green	Morrison (WA)
Boxer	Guarini	Mrazek
Breaux	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Brooks	Hamilton	Myers
Brown (CA)	Hatcher	Natcher
Bruce	Hawkins	Nowak
Bryant	Hayes	Oakar
Burton (CA)	Hefner	Oberstar
Bustamante	Heftel	Obey
Carney	Horton	Olin
Carr	Howard	Owens
Chandler	Hoyer	Panetta
Clinger	Jeffords	Parris
Coelho	Jenkins	Pease
Coleman (TX)	Johnson	Pepper
Collins	Jones (NC)	Perkins
Conte	Jones (TN)	Petri
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pickle
Cooper	Kaptur	Price
Coyne	Kastenmeier	Rahall
Crockett	Kennelly	Rangel
Daschle	Kildee	Ray
Davis	Kleczka	Regula
de la Garza	Kolter	Reid
Dellums	Kostmayer	Richardson
Derrick	LaFalce	Ridge
Dicks	Lantos	Rinaldo
Dingell	Lehman (CA)	Rodino
DioGuardi	Lehman (FL)	Roe
Dixon	Leland	Rogers
Donnelly	Lent	Rose
Dorgan (ND)	Levin (MI)	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	Levine (CA)	Rowland (CT)
Downey	Lewis (FL)	Rowland (GA)
Durbin	Lipinski	Roybal
Dwyer	Lloyd	Russo
Dymally	Long	Sabo

Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Schumer
Seiberling
Shelby
Sikorski
Skeen
Skellton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Solarez
Spratt
St Germain
Stallings

Archer
Armey
AuCoin
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Billakis
Bliley
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Carper
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dreier
Duncan
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gibbons
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling

Addabbo
Anthony
Applegate
Barnard
Byron
Clay
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Edwards (OK)

Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmmer

NAYS—171

Gradison
Gregg
Gutberg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jones (OK)
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lott
Lukens
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Murphy

NOT VOTING—26

Fowler
Fuqua
Garcia
Hunter
Loeffler
Lujan
McKinney
Moody
Nelson

Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

Neal
Nichols
Nielsen
Oxley
Packard
Pashayan
Penny
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith, Denny
(OR)
Smith, Robert
(NH)
Smith, Robert
(OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weaver
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wortley
Wylie
Zschau

Ms. KAPTUR and Messrs. SKELTON, LOWERY of California, and BEDELL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

□ 1140

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 398, on the conference report on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations for 1986, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 14, after "Annex" insert "": *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act shall be available for the salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations, after March 1, 1986, unless United States Customs Service authorizing legislation is passed by the Congress."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the follow: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations if any of the following products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the customs territory of the United States after December 31, 1985, unless the Commissioner of Customs is provided with sufficient information pursuant to 19 CFR 12.43 attesting to the fact that the products have not been produced, manufactured, or mined (in whole or in part) by forced labor, convict labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions:

- "(1) gold ore,
- "(2) agricultural machinery,
- "(3) tractor generators,
- "(4) tea,
- "(5) crude petroleum,
- "(6) motor fuel,
- "(7) kerosene, and
- "(8) any other product that the Commissioner of Customs determines to have been produced, manufactured, or mined (in whole or in part) by forced labor, convict labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to hinder or impede the Commissioner of Customs in making determinations under subsection (8) of the preceding proviso."

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McKINNEY for, with Mr. SILJANDER against.

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane to the Senate amendment numbered 3 under clause 7 of rule XVI of the rules of the House.

Senate amendment numbered 3 provides that no funds shall be available for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations after March 1, 1986, unless Congress passes authorizing legislation for the U.S. Customs Service.

The proposed substitute amendment, on the other hand, prohibits funding of that office unless seven specific categories of products and other categories determined by the Commissioner of Customs to be produced by slave or convict labor in the Soviet Union are barred entry into the United States after December 31.

The amendment clearly raises new issues and involves subject matter quite different from the Senate amendment. It also constitutes legislation specifically to prohibit certain imports within the jurisdiction of another committee.

For these reasons, the point of order should be sustained that the proposed amendment is not germane.

□ 1150

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order at this particular point, and I just would like to state that the original Senate amendment provided that none of the funds contained in this or any other act shall be available unless the U.S. Customs Service authorizing legislation is passed by the Congress.

I am not going to ask the Chair to rule on this, but I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the committee's position.

This provision is more restrictive than the amendment in the Senate bill in that, No. 1, it limits the prohibition of funds to those made available by this act only and it does not apply to any other act.

No. 2, the language included in the amendment could appropriately be included in the authorizing legislation designated in the Senate amendment. It, therefore, does not address any additional topic, question, issue, or proposition not committed to committee or conference because the Customs authorizing legislation could contain all of the provisions included in the amendment.

It is the committee's position that the primary purpose of this provision is not to change the scope of existing law. The purpose of this amendment is to compel the U.S. Customs Service to enforce existing laws.

I would like to put the administration on notice that we expect them to start enforcing the law.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I concede the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman concedes the point of order, and the point of order of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] is sustained.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] is recognized.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the committee for the cooperation that it has shown to other Members of Congress who have been concerned about the personnel levels in the Customs Service. I happen to believe that it is one of those situations where the action of the committee and the conference committee will, in fact, improve the operation of the Customs Service, and will certainly help those of us in the Pacific Northwest who have brought this issue to the attention of the chairman. He has really been a champion on this issue, and I just want to compliment him for the work.

The additional personnel, I think, will produce revenues for the Treasury and the Customs Service, and they will certainly help us deal with the serious problems that we have had in the Service.

I just want to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] for his leadership.

Also, I want to compliment our good friend, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], who has also cooperated in this important endeavor.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would associate with an echo the words of my colleague from Washington in behalf of those of us on the southern border, and we thank the chairman for this leadership in this effort.

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment number 19: Page 6, line 11, after "1986" insert "and shall assign no fewer than forty additional permanent, full time personnel to the Seattle, Washington, Customs District Office, including at least thirty inspectors and ten import specialists".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for administrative expenses to reduce the personnel level of the Customs Service during fiscal year 1986 below an average of 14,041 full time equivalent positions".

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 20, 42, 47, 51, 52, 55, 61, 64, and 76 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk designated Senate amendments numbered 20, 42, 47, 51, 52, 55, 61, 64, and 76, as follows:

Senate amendment number 20: Page 6, after line 11, insert:

None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to fund more than nine hundred and fifty positions in the headquarters staff of the United States Customs Service in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986 and the Customs Service shall begin planning to reduce headquarters staff to no more than nine hundred positions by September 30, 1987.

Senate amendment number 42: Page 14, line 2, after "1986" insert "": *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act may be used to support in-county second-class rates of postage for any issue of a publication unless more than 50 per centum plus one copy of the total paid circulation is distributed within the county of publication, or the total paid circulation of the publication is under 10,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to support the mailing of nonsubscriber copies of such publications at the in-county second-class rates of postage at any time during the calendar year in excess of 10 per centum of the total weight of copies mailed to subscribers at the in-county rate during the calendar year".

Senate amendment number 47: Page 18, line 4, after "Affairs" insert "": *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be used to reduce the scope or publication frequency of statistical data relative to the operations and production of the alcoholic beverage and tobacco industries below fiscal year 1985 levels".

Senate amendment number 51: Page 20, strike out line 4 and insert "For additional expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the fund established".

Senate amendment number 52: Page 20, line 9, after "for," insert "\$7,000,000 to be deposited into said fund. The revenues and collections deposited into said fund".

Senate amendment number 55: Page 21, after line 14, insert:

New Jersey:
Newark, Federal Building, Courthouse,
\$44,975,000

Senate amendment number 61: Page 26, line 23, after "collections:" insert "*Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 available herein for design and construction shall be available for transfer to the city of Mesa, Arizona for expenses in connection with the design and construction of a Federal building in Mesa, Arizona:

Senate amendment number 64: Page 28, line 7, strike out "costs associated with" and insert "and associated costs in".

Senate amendment number 76: Page 34, line 2, after "purpose" insert "": *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used for preparing, promulgating, or implementing new regulations for the 1985 Combined Federal Campaign other than repromulgating and implementing the 1984 regulations for the 1985 campaign. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to apply to the regulations for the 1986 Combined Federal Campaign".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 42, 47, 51, 52, 55, 61, 64, and 76, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment number 68: Page 29, after line 18, insert:

NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE TRANSPORTATION FUND

For the year ending September 30, 1986, in addition to the funds previously appropriated for the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98a and g(a)(2)(c) and 50 U.S.C. 100(a), notwithstanding the provisions of 50 U.S.C. 98h, an additional \$15,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until expended, for a grant to construct Phase II of the Mines Building at the Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada, Reno, relocate the Generic Center on the Recycling of Strategic Metals and establish the Policy Center on Strategic Materials, including such equipment as the school deems necessary to the conduct of its activities.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

For the year ending September 30, 1986, in addition to the funds previously appropriated for the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98a and g(a)(2)(c) and 50 U.S.C. 100(a), notwithstanding the provisions of 50 U.S.C. 98h, an additional \$10,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until expended, for a grant to construct Phase II of the Mines Building at the Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada, Reno, relocate the Generic Center on the Recycling of Strategic Metals and establish the Policy Center on Strategic Materials, including such equipment as the school deems necessary to the conduct of its activities.

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment number 71: Page 32, strike out lines 8 to 11, inclusive.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

Sec. 6. Funds hereafter made available to the General Services Administration for the payment of rent shall be available for the purpose of leasing, for periods not to exceed thirty years, space in buildings erected on land owned by the United States.

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment number 97: Page 54, after line 16, insert:

Sec. 615. The increase in postage rates for nonprofit and certain other mailers announced by the Governors of the Postal Service in Resolution No. 85-7 shall not take effect until January 1, 1986.

Sec. 616. (a) Section 3626(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In the administration of Subchapters II and III of this chapter, each time rates of postage are established for mail under former sections 4358, 4452 (b) and (c), and 4554 (b) and (c) of this title, the estimated revenues to be received for each class or kind of such mail shall be equal to the direct and indirect postal costs attributable to mail of such class or kind excluding all other costs of the Postal Service."

(b) This section is effective January 1, 1986.

Sec. 617. If the postage rate delay required by section 615 of this Act causes a shortfall in postal revenues from the amounts which would have been provided by the adjustment contemplated by section 3627 of title 39, United States Code, the Postal Service shall request a supplemental appropriation to avoid placing the burden of that shortfall on unsubsidized mailers.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Sec. 616. The increase in postage rates for nonprofit and certain other mailers announced by the Governors of the Postal

Service in Resolution No. 85-7 shall not take effect until January 1, 1986.

Sec. 617. (a) Section 3626(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In the administration of Subchapters II and III of this chapter, each time rates of postage are established for mail under former sections 4358, 4452 (b) and (c), and 4554 (b) and (c) of this title, the estimated revenues to be received for each class or kind of such mail shall be equal to the direct and indirect postal costs attributable to mail of such class of kind excluding all other costs of the Postal Service."

(b) This section is effective January 1, 1986.

Sec. 618. If the postage rate delay required by section 616 of this Act causes a shortfall in postal revenues from the amounts which would have been provided by the adjustment contemplated by section 3627 of title 39, United States Code, the Postal Service shall request a supplemental appropriation to avoid placing the burden of that shortfall on unsubsidized mailers.

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment number 98: Page 54, after line 16, insert:

Sec. 618 (a) If any individual or entity which provides or proposes to provide child care services for Federal employees applies to the officer or agency of the United States charged with the allotment of space in the Federal buildings in the community or district in which such individual or entity provides or proposes to provide such services, such officer or agency may allot space in such a building to such individual or entity if—

(1) such space is available; and
(2) such officer or agency determines that such space will be used to provide child care services to a group of individuals of whom at least 95 percent are Federal employees.

(b)(1) If an officer or agency allots space to an individual or entity under subsection (a), such space may be provided to such individual or entity without charge for rent or services.

(2) If there is an agreement for the payment of costs associated with the provision of space allotted under subsection (a) or services provided in connection with such space, nothing in title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, shall be construed to prohibit or restrict payment by reimbursement to the miscellaneous receipts or other appropriate account of the Treasury.

(3) For the purpose of this section, the term "services" includes the providing of lighting, heating, cooling, electricity, office furniture, office machines and equipment, telephone service (including installation of

lines and equipment and other expenses associated with telephone service), and security systems (including installation and other expenses associated with security systems).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYBAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "619".

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1570, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1570) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide rules for overtime compensatory time off for certain public agency employees, to clarify the application of that act to volunteers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 1, 1985.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly restate my appreciation for the bipartisan efforts which produced the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which we enact today. I hope that all Members fully appreciate the hard work, the sincere debate, and the compromise which has produced this important legislation.

During the conference, there were three issues which surfaced which generated substantial debate, and I would like to take just a few moments to offer very brief clarification of those issues.

First, the conferees debated at length whether or not to impose an intent standard in conjunction with section 8, the provision providing for protection against discrimination. A series of words were offered and rejected, including "motivated," and the word, "intended" itself. Each of these words was rejected for the specific purpose of ensuring that section 8 would not be construed to require a showing of intent in conjunction with an employee's discrimination charge.

We also stated that victims of discrimination must show "that coverage was asserted." In offering those clarifying words, we intended only to ensure that some act constituting notification to an employer of the Department of Labor occurred in a timely fashion. Thus, so long as there is an assertion of coverage by an employee or an employee representative, or by an employee on behalf of another employee or employees, this assertion of coverage requirement is fully satisfied.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, although section 8 of the bill does not prohibit States and municipalities from adjusting wage rates out of fiscal necessity, the section would prohibit such wage rate adjustments if the action was in response to extending coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage.

The statement of managers makes it clear that such wage adjustments made after the enactment of this legislation cannot be directly attributable to the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am in agreement with the words of the chairman of the committee and would like to say that we all worked hard in conference to bring about a reconciliation of the issues in disagreement.

The only areas that really required any kind of compromise had to do with the caps on hours; where we left the cap for public safety and similar employees the same, but raised the cap

for other employees to 240 from 180 hours.

We also gave the employee full protection on retirement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] in order to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and would like the attention of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California, Mr. HAWKINS, for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this legislation is intended to be neutral with respect to both employee and employer rights in any action by employees challenging the lawfulness of an employer's unilateral reduction of regular pay or fringe benefits instituted prior to enactment of these amendments. I would ask if this is the chairman's understanding as well.

Mr. HAWKINS. If the gentleman will yield. The gentleman's understanding is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his response.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my gratitude, and what I think is the gratitude of all State and local and municipal employees throughout the country, for the leadership and the patience and the diligence that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] has displayed in bringing this issue to the floor, and in fact, in passing this legislation into law. This legislation is the result of bipartisan negotiation in which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] has displayed a great deal of leadership.

We have also had a great deal of leadership and insight displayed by the ranking member, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

I would also comment as a fellow Texan that we received a great deal of assistance from my colleague from Texas, Mr. BOULTER of Amarillo, because the gentleman from Texas added a great deal to the substance of the debate to ensure that this bill was brought to the floor today in a form that was acceptable to all. I thank the gentleman from yielding and for his leadership.

□ 1205

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his tremendous efforts on this bill, and would join in the words of commendation for the members of the committee as well as

the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER] to whom I will now yield.

Mr. BOULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to engage in a brief colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. BOULTER. I would like to reiterate my colleague from Texas' query. As you know, the city of Amarillo, which I represent, undertook to comply with the Garcia decision in June of this year. The city's actions have been challenged in court. After attending the recent conference committee meeting on this legislation and after studying both the conference agreement and the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference, it is my understanding that this legislation is expressly neutral with respect to that litigation. I would ask if that is the distinguished chairman's understanding as well.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. While I am not familiar with the facts of that case, I believe the gentleman to be correct. Of course, my response is not intended to be inconsistent with the statutory language and the statement of managers which must govern.

Mr. BOULTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express gratitude to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], and to the distinguished chairman, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], and to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] for the many courtesies shown to me as a non-member of that conference.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again commend the gentlemen from Texas for their efforts in this legislation, and also the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] on our side, and again thank the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for their tremendous assistance and nonpartisan attitude toward this very important legislation.

Mr. PETRI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in this round of appreciation. This was a difficult and sensitive area, and I think the committee and the House acted responsibly in addressing it and meeting a need that was going to disrupt the lives of a lot of State and local employees around the country, and also the budgets of many of our local governments across the country. I know that the subcommittee will be keeping an eye on this area and if

there are other problems that develop, we will try to be attentive to those problems too.

I want to particularly thank the staff on the subcommittee for all the work that they did on both the majority and minority sides in bringing this legislation to successful fruition.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I am pleased that the administration supports the language in this conference report, and that the Secretary of Labor, Secretary Brock, has been of great assistance and help to us. I know all of us want to extend our appreciation for all of his efforts and those of his staff.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join in the appreciation extended to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS]; the ranking minority member of the Labor Standards Subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI]; and to the very active efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

I think that these gentlemen have expressed the highest dedication to the handling of this subject and in a bipartisan and very constructive manner.

At this time, I yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], whose patience and whose diligent efforts to effect a compromise are, I think, largely responsible for the legislation which is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1985. After many weeks of work by our subcommittee staff, representing both sides of the House, on behalf of all of the members on the Committee on Education and Labor, and many, many individual Members of the House and the other body, and certainly I cannot go without recognizing the efforts put in by the representatives of the various governmental organizations representing the municipalities and States of our country, and then that of the public employees and their representatives who worked so diligently to craft what I think is a very fair and balanced approach to the coverage of municipal employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I thank my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], for his full support and guidance in this very important measure.

The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was correct in his summary of the act; what we are permitting now in municipal governments to do, is to

handle their own personnel matters, handling the schedule of their employees as they deem fit, but with the fairness that we attempt to employ in the Fair Labor Standards Act for all employees in our country.

We have allowed comp time, or compensatory time up to 480 hours to be accumulated by public safety employees. That means that they may take 8 full weeks of employment and bank that time as their employer and the employees deem necessary, and claim it at any later time at 1½ times the rate during the course of their employment.

For nonpublic service and nonseasonal employees, we allow the banking of 240 hours, or 4 full weeks of employment, that they may delay the time taken off and save the municipalities that cost of cash payment of that overtime.

We have fully clarified that volunteers are permitted in municipal employment; that even those engaged in the same occupation may freely trade with their coworkers and volunteer their time in place of their coworker without jeopardizing the necessity of cash payments for the overtime.

We have figured the final comp time upon the employee severance as the best or the highest of the average of his last 3 years of work, or his last year of work, whichever is at the higher level.

We have taken care of a particular situation for Puerto Rico and other territories so that they may have a little more time to come in compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, we have brought about a compromise between all of the interested parties involved. I urge all of the Members of the House to support this measure unanimously, and again thank the members of my subcommittee for their diligent and patient work.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this Congress has today adopted legislation seeking to reverse the unsound position reached by the U.S. Supreme Court in its *Garcia* versus San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority ruling.

Under this decision, it appeared that State and local governments would have been required to restrict the use of compensatory time. This decision would have most certainly proven extremely expensive to units of local governments that are already experiencing very serious financial hardships.

As Mr. Michael Morton, the Washington Township administrator for Montgomery County, OH, expressed to me:

I have never experienced a year where so many Federal decisions have had such a negative impact on local government employers and employees. First it was the IRS ruling re: Taxation of employee benefits Then came the Supreme Court's decision in the *Garcia* case. The impact of this case will be immense, especially to small and medium-sized fire departments like our own.

The new guidelines will cost the township around \$75,000 annually to implement or about 7 percent of the department's total budget. . . . I hope you can feel our total frustration with this barrage of Federal "expertise." I hope that you will move quickly to make appropriate changes.

It is a pleasure to finally be able to tell Mr. Morton, and all other local officials like him that the Congress has heard his plea. Legislation approved by both the House and the Senate, and resolved in conference, will seek to continue the system of local government flexibility that has existed over time. Indeed, this legislation will restore to the State and local governments the flexibility needed to schedule their employees to best serve the needs of their own areas. I commend my colleagues for this necessary resolution to a very unnecessary Court decision.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that a resolution has been achieved on this highly controversial and complex issue and that the basic components of my bill, H.R. 2866, are reflected in this legislation. As a result of the February 19, 1985, Supreme Court decision, State and local governments would be forced to pay their employees overtime compensation instead of compensatory time off. If allowed to stand, the *Garcia* decision would have abruptly altered the employment and budgetary operations of State and local governments. To taxpayers across the country, this would have meant substantial increases in moneys spent for training and for overtime pay.

On June 25, 1985, when I introduced H.R. 2866, I was a lone spokesman advocating the rights of employees affected by the Supreme Court's *Garcia* decision. When I introduced my bill, most of my colleagues were somewhat disturbed that I had introduced legislation of this nature. Their concern was that my bill would only open the floodgates, allowing amendment after amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, specifically the subminimum wage issue.

My concern went much further. I wanted to protect the rights of employees and grant some relief to already strained city budgets. H.R. 2866 would have amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, to permit employees engaged in law enforcement and fire protection activities to take compensatory time off in lieu of receiving overtime pay.

The conference report on H.R. 3530 will solve many of the problems associated with the Supreme Court's decision. The bill will continue to allow compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay. However, now, as was in my bill, comp time must be computed at the rate of 1½ hours for each hour of overtime worked. The conference language allows a maximum of 480 hours of comp time per year to be banked for employees engaged in public safety and 240 hours of comp time for all other employees. But most importantly, the new legislation will protect employees who have been discriminated against by asserting overtime coverage since the *Garcia* decision.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to know that my bill served as a catalyst to

bring about a compromise on an issue that could have caused severe hardships to many State and local governments and their employees.

This legislation is not everything I or anybody else wanted, but it will grant governments and employees some relief from the problems associated with the Supreme Court decision.

This legislation has the support of Ray Maples, president of the Memphis Police Association and hundreds of other labor leaders and I think it is a fair compromise and will benefit thousands of municipal employees nationwide.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, this year's Supreme Court ruling in the case of *Garcia* versus San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority is already posing serious budgetary and administrative problems for State and local governments.

Since the Supreme Court decision, many flexible employment practices have been suspended. Volunteers have to be compensated at least at the minimum wage. Accruing compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay—a practice used extensively by police and firefighters—is prohibited.

In light of these budgetary hardships, I rise in support of the conference agreement for H.R. 3530, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1985. This legislation overturns the rigid interpretations of the Supreme Court decision, and returns greater flexibility to State and local government employment practices. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this agreement.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this conference report on S. 1570, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments. As my colleagues know, this bill reflects the tireless work of so many of our colleagues, representatives of State and local governments, the employee associations, and the Department of Labor.

It will deflect the blow from State and local governments of the *Garcia* decision, saving taxpayers millions of dollars while protecting the rights of State and local employees.

Unfortunately, we were unable to consider this legislation last Friday. While there were several hours during the afternoon for thorough review of the conference report, I understand that the required papers were temporarily mislaid in the other body. By the time they were available, the House, unfortunately, had adjourned, even though I voted against adjournment.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation in order to put to rest the persistent questions raised by the *Garcia* decision.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3530, which would alleviate some of the damage caused by the Supreme Court decision in the *Garcia* versus San Antonio case.

This court decision has wreaked havoc upon our State and local municipalities, especially in the scheduling, budget, and volunteer departments. It is ironic that a

measure which was originally designed to ensure employee rights, and create additional jobs, has instead had the impact of reducing services, creating layoffs, and raising taxes.

The cost of this action is monumental. Without any reversal or revision of Garcia, the cost to my home State of Minnesota alone is estimated at \$22 million a year and nationwide cost estimates loom at \$2 to \$4 billion yearly. We need to pass H.R. 3530 with great urgency in order to eliminate some of the problems created by reinstating the 1974 Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act for our State and local governments. What we need even more is a total repeal of the Garcia decision. However, since that much-needed action was not given to us as an option, the bill before us will at least lessen the severity of the impact of Garcia upon our cities and States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3530.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 1570, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the distinguished majority whip for the purpose of inquiring about the program for next week.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes the legislative business for today. Tomorrow, the House will be in pro forma session, and it would be my intention in a moment to offer a unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The House will not meet on Monday, it being Veterans Day.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon and consider three suspensions under the suspension rule; H.R. 2722,

to require the decennial census to eliminate the drainage census; an unnumbered H.R. relating to the proposed sales of arms to Jordan; and H.R. 1523, the Handicapped Children's Protection Act.

It would be our intention to postpone recorded votes on suspensions until after the debate on those suspensions, but I emphasize that any votes ordered on Tuesday will be taken on Tuesday, and will not be postponed to another day.

In addition, the House will consider an unnumbered H.R. relating to the continuing appropriations—I think that is House Joint Resolution 441; and, subject to a rule being granted, H.R. 1616, the Labor-Management Notification and Consultation Act of 1985, sometimes known as the plant closing bill. An open rule with 2 hours of debate, to consider the rule and general debate only.

So there will be suspensions, to be voted on after debate; there will be the consideration of the continuing resolution extension, and there will be the rule and general debate only on H.R. 1616.

□ 1215

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. and return to H.R. 6, the Water Resources Act of 1985, to complete consideration; and H.R. 1616, Labor-Management Notification and Consultation Act of 1985, to complete consideration.

Members, of course, should expect possible further action on the debt limit bill whenever such action is available for consideration of the House. But the likelihood of some action is very high likelihood for next week. The House is not scheduled to meet on Friday, November 15.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I also inquire of the distinguished majority whip: I am not sure my memory serves me correctly whether on the milk bill and the Superfund legislation that we extended to November 14, in which case I think the farm provisions would expire. Is there anything in the works on a temporary extension on either of those items?

Mr. FOLEY. We may have to request some Rules Committee action for temporary extension next week. The gentleman is correct with respect to the expiration.

Mr. MICHEL. I did dispatch a letter yesterday to the Speaker with respect to the Superfund suggesting some way by which we may hopefully bring about—

Mr. FOLEY. We do not anticipate a more permanent action on the Superfund bill next week. So it may be necessary to consider some temporary legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1985, TO TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1985

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING VETERANS DAY

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Monday, November 11, marks the Nation's annual observance of Veterans Day across the country. Appropriate events have been scheduled to pay tribute to the 28 million living veterans and to the more than 1 million who have died in military service.

Mr. Speaker, ceremonies, speeches, parades, visits to a veteran's gravesite, and displaying the flag are all excellent ways to honor our veterans. But we must also show our appreciation daily by exercising our most precious rights—voting, worshiping, traveling, and speaking freely.

Without our veterans, these rights would not be possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, when your sons march off to war, they left their families, friends, homes, and jobs. They were heroes then and should be treated as heroes now.

So let us say "thanks" to a veteran on Monday.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 441, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mrs. BURTON of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-361) on the resolution (H. Res. 312) providing for the consideration of the joint reso-

lution (H.J. Res. 441) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1616, LABOR-MANAGEMENT NOTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION ACT OF 1985

Mrs. BURTON of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-362) on the resolution (H. Res. 313) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1616) to require employers to notify and consult with employees before ordering a plant closing or permanent layoff, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SEPARATING AMERICAN CITIZENS FROM ILLEGAL ALIENS FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, every 10 years the Census Bureau determines population shifts in the United States. As a result of the census report, high growth areas gain additional congressional seats, and slow growth areas lose seats. This seems sensible and fair. Most Americans agree that the right policy for democracies to follow in elections is "one citizen, one vote."

But the Midwest could lose seats in Congress during the 1990's because the Census Bureau counts illegal aliens when determining how many representatives each State should have.

By counting illegal aliens as if they were citizens, the Census Bureau is threatening to move congressional seats from the Midwest to the South and Southwest. The essential injustice of this situation should be obvious.

Accordingly, today I am introducing legislation directing the Census Bureau to separate American citizens from illegal aliens for the purpose of congressional reapportionment.

It is a fundamental principle that each American citizen should have an equal voice in our Government. Let's make our law consistent with that principle.

COOPER LAKE PROJECT

(Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was 8 years old when the U.S. Congress au-

thorized the Cooper Lake project. H.R. 6, now under consideration by this body, contains an authorization of \$14.7 million for the mitigation of fish and wildlife resources for Cooper Lake. This authorization will kick down the final barrier that has existed for over 30 years to the completion of this needed resource in northeast Texas.

Mr. Speaker, two great Americans, Sam Rayburn and Wright Patman, recognized the need for this project over 30 years ago, and gained the initial approval needed for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this institution is now prepared to go forward with this needed project in my district, and I am pleased that it is included in the provisions of H.R. 6.

I look forward to the passage of H.R. 6 and the early development and completion of this valued resource in northeast Texas.

OUR VETERANS GAVE THEIR ALL THAT WE MIGHT LIVE

(Mr. DANIEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next we observe Veterans' Day. More than 40 million Americans have fought in the wars in which this country has been engaged. Over a million did not return to enjoy the fruits of that sacrifice:

They did give, that you might live, our country; their lives and the air when the need was there; their bodies to the sea when that had to be; their sweat and toil, their blood to the soil; before they would yield a rock, a pebble, or a field of this, our country.

Blood, sinew, and bone, all they had, all they did own they did give; that you might live, our country.

THE HUMAN TOLL OF THE FARM CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the farm crisis is bad and is getting worse. The American farmer is the backbone of our Nation and the foundation of our economy. Yet today, he is suffering as he has not suffered since the depths of the Great Depression.

The black clouds on the farm horizon are a stern warning to every citizen of tough times ahead. The following is an article in the Wall Street Journal of November 7, 1985, which I urge my colleagues to read:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 7, 1985]

FARM CRISIS IS TAKING SUTLE TOLL ON CHILDREN IN DISTRESSED FAMILIES

(By Wendy L. Wall)

SPIRIT LAKE, IOWA.—Aleta Kuhlman's childhood memories are like a series of Norman Rockwell paintings.

On brisk spring mornings, her family took turns stumbling to the barn in the pre-dawn dark to help struggling ewes give birth. When cows got loose in the cornfield, the whole family would saddle up and ride roundup. On frigid winter nights, they sometimes gathered in the basement to feed wobbly calves and lambs out of baby bottles.

But last fall, the idyll shattered. Threatening to foreclose, the family's bank phoned repeatedly with orders to sell more sheep. Aleta's parents quarreled bitterly. The strong, energetic father whom she idolized sat listlessly, refusing to eat or go outside.

One bright morning a year ago, the 17-year-old took her father's shotgun to the grove behind the house and put it to her head. After a long period of hesitation, she finally broke down and returned, distraught, to the house.

CLIMATE OF HOPELESSNESS

The high-school senior survived her brush with suicide. But her dreams of a life on the farm are gone, a casualty of the most prolonged and severe farm recession in recent memory. The farm economy's sudden plunge from the giddy heights of the 1970s to its current crushing low has brought with it emotional stresses in some ways more brutal even than those of the Depression.

The upheaval is taking a mounting toll on a generation of rural youth. The tranquility of rural life is vanishing, and countless farm children now are growing up in the atmosphere of constant worry, hopelessness, alienation or outright fear.

As century-old farms are threatened, marriages often crack and generations divide. Family abuse rates are rising as some farmers vent their frustrations in alcoholism or violence. Farm suicides are increasing. "It's scary to see your folks scared," says Kristy Miller, a spirited 15-year-old from Ogden, Iowa.

Ironically, the very factors that have long made farm childhood special—the tight bonds of farm families tied to the land—exacerbate the current troubles. "Farm families are a unique population. There are no clear boundaries between job and family," says Frances Joslin, a psychologist at the Southwest Iowa Mental Health Clinic.

LINGERING EFFECTS

Joan Blundall, a counselor at the Northwest Iowa Mental Health Center, worked in Rhode Island eight years ago when the Electric Boat division of General Dynamics Corp. laid off 3,000 employees in the region. That was a financial catastrophe, too, she says, yet it didn't have the lingering emotional effects she sees in the Midwest. Farm kids, who often are deeply involved in the family business, "really grieve about not doing chores with Dad. It's a whole lot different from cleaning out the garage."

Until last December, Matt and Josh Tangeman rose daily at 5 a.m. to help their father feed the hogs and clean their pens. Each boy had his own gilt, or young female, and Josh expected a litter of piglets soon. Then, one bitterly cold day, men sent by the bank loaded the hogs and hauled them off to slaughter.

For weeks, Matt, a burly 10-year-old with a sad smile, lay awake at night, sobbing. Nine-year-old Josh, previously a good student, had so much trouble concentrating he nearly failed third grade.

"I miss having the hogs," Matt tells a visitor, biting his lip. And Josh, fighting back tears, admits he feared losing his house and parents, too. "In these kids' minds, they were violated because someone came on the property and took their pigs away," says Mrs. Blundall, who counseled the family.

SCHOOL FIGHTS

Increasingly, the troubles of farm parents add tension to their children's lives. Jared Taylor, a precocious sixth grader from Dickens, Iowa, used his savings and the bonds his grandparents gave him when he was born to help pay his family's electricity, water and telephone bills last winter.

Jared, an only child, still shoots barn spiders with his BB gun and scales rafters in the family's 80-year-old barn. But the care-free days of youth are gone. His parents both have severe health problems—aggravated by the recent stress—and Jared worries that one day they will have an accident or leave. He refused to go to a youth camp for a week last summer. And when his father was late returning home one evening, the boy sat in the car and honked until his mother agreed to go in search of her husband. "I was scared," he recalls. "I thought something might have happened."

In Sibley, Iowa, school nurse Julie Helmers says more fights break out now in junior high because edgy students are quick to take offense. The number of children coming to her with minor complaints—often a sign of depression—has doubled in the last two years.

Others across the Farm Belt tell similar stories. The Rev. Delano Cunningham, a Methodist minister in Palmer, Neb., counseled one 16-year-old girl who accidentally learned of her family's voluntary bankruptcy filing while sitting in the local cafe. Five days later, she developed a problem of bed-wetting. And a boy aged 2½ suddenly started stuttering when the family farm began to founder. "All this little one could hear was his parents' voices being raised at the other end of the house," the minister says.

Arlene and Norman Kunkle were forced off their rolling Missouri farm around Thanksgiving 1983. In the dead of winter, Mrs. Kunkle sold some scrap iron, firewood and a 1938 Chevy to make a down payment on a tiny trailer, the size of two rooms in her former farmhouse. Her husband spent months in and out of hospitals, being treated for severe depression.

Shunned in church, taunted in school and often subsisting on skimpy meals, the Kunkles' four youngest children reflected the stress. Christopher, formerly an A and B student, started bring home Ds. KiKi, then 11, cried with little provocation. Carol, then a high-school junior, had such severe headaches and stomachaches that her mother suspected an ulcer.

Fifteen-year-old Kerri, his dreams of joining his father on the farm dashed, turned violent. The former altar boy threatened his brother with a switchblade and stabbed his father in the arm with a paring knife. "Kerri blamed Dad. He blamed him for losing the farm," Mrs. Kunkle says simply.

The family has recovered better than many. Mrs. Kunkle, who is a registered nurse, got a night job in a nursing home, and her husband's condition has improved. Christopher's grades are edging up, KiKi smiles more, and Carol won a scholarship

and is studying nursing. Kerri has finally calmed down. "A lot of Kerri might have been that he was hungry," his mother says.

Even so, scars remain. Kerri, staring straight ahead and shielding his eyes, speaks of the lost farm: "I always thought even after I left home, it'd always be there, I'd always have something to come home to," he says. "You've got to watch how you make your money or you'll lose it all. It'd make me think twice before I'd borrow a large amount."

"We talk about the Depression mentality," says William Heffernan, a rural sociologist at the University of Missouri. "It will probably have a similar impact here."

MORE RUNAWAYS

As pressures mount, problems long common to urban areas are taking root in the country. In the rural communities around Mitchell, S.D., where there have been 14 farm suicides in the past 20 months, teen-age alcoholism is on the rise. Mr. Cunningham in Nebraska says calls to him concerning suicidal teens have tripled in the last year. An Iowa group called Youth and Shelter Services has seen a sharp jump in rural teen-age runaways.

Jeanet Mosher, a bubbly red-haired teenager, recalls the rising panic she felt one night last winter as she sat alone in her darkened bedroom watching the flashing lights of a squad car in the driveway. When her parents returned home, the sheriff delivered foreclosure papers.

The Moshers are still on their Milo, Iowa, farm, but Jeanet isn't. Last spring she ran away, and now she lives with a married sister in nearby Indianola. "You're wondering if the farm is going to be there tomorrow and if you're going to be there tomorrow," she says. "It's nerve racking. I just couldn't handle the stress."

Jeanet says she misses Sunday dinners at home, but she vows not to return until her parents' troubles have ended: "I didn't want them or their problems to mess up my life. I don't think I should be punished for decisions they made."

The stress affects even some youngsters who weren't reared on the farm. Kim Smith, the associate director of the Menninger Clinic of Albuquerque, N.M., a new branch of the Topeka, Kan., Psychiatric hospital and research institute, has been called into six or seven rural towns with teen suicide problems since 1982. He believes the farm crisis indirectly spurred the outbreaks. "When a county begins to see foreclosures at such a rate, it sets up a pessimistic sense of life in general—that life is a hard struggle," he says.

COUNSELING EFFORTS

Other mental-health workers say couples under the stress of losing a farm sometimes suffer such a setback in their self-confidence that they become ineffective parents. Some specialists think factors like this and a general sense of hopelessness may be related to a rise in rates of teen-age pregnancy in some rural counties, at a time when such rates nationwide are declining slightly.

Youth agencies, schools and others generally have been slow to wake up to the problems, but some are beginning to take action. In Iowa, Youth and Shelter Services is doing more suicide prevention work in schools and setting up outreach programs in rural areas. The Iowa 4H is training its staff to spot stress in youngsters and deal with it. And Iowa teachers are being shown a videotape entitled "The Rural Crisis Comes to School."

All this may help, but it isn't likely to halt farm children's flight away from agriculture. Participation in vocational agriculture classes, 4H programs and Future Farmers of America has declined sharply in recent years. Enrollments at agricultural colleges are dropping too. Many kids "don't want to have anything to do with farming. They just want to get away," says Rex Campbell, a rural sociologist at the University of Missouri.

That worries Paul Lassley, a rural sociologist at Iowa State. "Just as we overreacted in the 1970s to continued agricultural expansion, we could overreact (to the recession) in the 1980s," he warns. "We could well wake up in 20 years and find out that we have a human capital shortage in agriculture."

Aleta Kuhlman will probably be one of those casualties. Despite her deep ties to the land, "I just kind of want to move away and start over," she says.

TRIBUTE TO INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN RESTAURANTEURS TED BALESTRERI AND BERT CUTINO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the people of Monterey will gather on November 10 to honor two of our most successful and well-known businessmen—Ted Balestreri and Bert Cutino, the owners of the renowned Sardine Factory in Monterey's Cannery Row.

Ted and Bert, who I am proud to say have been good friends of mine for many years, are being honored for the contribution they have made to the tourism and hospitality industry along the California coastline, which is one of the mainstays of the economy not only of coastal communities but of the entire State.

The Sardine Factory is well known as one of the finest restaurants in the Nation. It has received a number of prestigious awards, including the Ivy Award, the Travel/Holiday Magazine Award, the Nation's Restaurant News Hall of Fame Award, the Mobil Travel Guide Award, the Signature Award of the Diners Club, the Business Executives Dining Award, Wine Spectator's Grand Award, and the Knights of the Vine Gold Vine Award. In addition, it has been named by the *Armstrong Gourmet Guide* as one of California's top 10 restaurants and was one of 50 restaurants selected to serve at the last two Presidential inaugurations.

Ted and Bert also operate the Carmel Butcher Shop in Carmel, the Rogue Restaurant on Fisherman's Wharf in Monterey, and the San Simeon Restaurant near the Hearst Castle in San Simeon. In addition, they own a number of real estate ventures together.

Ted was born in Brooklyn, NY, and moved to the Monterey Peninsula in 1957. He graduated from Carmel High School in 1958 and attended Monterey Peninsula College as well as Lewis Management School

in Washington, DC. He has worked in the hospitality industry as everything from busboy to owner.

Ted has been very active in the hospitality industry both locally and nationally. He currently serves as president of the National Restaurant Association. He is a past president of the California Restaurant Association and is also past chairman of the executive and finance committee of the CRA. He is a member of the board of trustees for the National Institute for the Food Service Industry and is a member of the Corporation of the Culinary Institute of America. Ted serves on the State of California's Tourism Corporation as well as on the California Tourism Commission.

Locally, Ted is a past president and one of the founders of the Monterey Peninsula Hotel and Restaurant Association. He is also a founder and past president of the Northern California Restaurant Association, which he helped move into a merger with the Southern California Restaurant Association to form the California Restaurant Association.

Ted has also served as regional director of the Monterey Peninsula chapter of the Wine Investigation for Novices and Oenophiles and is currently a master knight in the Monterey Chapter of the Brotherhood of the Knights of the Vine. He served as bailli of the Monterey chapter of the Confrerie de la Chaine des Rotisseurs.

In the community, Ted has been appointed to serve on the Monterey County Sheriff's Advisory Council and is chairman of the membership committee of the Monterey Chamber of Commerce.

In 1981, Ted received the Restaurant Hospitality Magazine's Hall of Fame Award, and in 1982, he received the Gold Plate Award from the American Academy of Achievement. He has also received the Outstanding Hospitality Professional Award from the Monterey Peninsula Hotel and Restaurant Association and the Silver Plate Award and the prestigious Gold Plate Award from the International Foodservice Manufacturers Association.

Ted and his wife, Velma, have two sons and live in Pebble Beach.

Bert Cutino was born in Monterey and graduated from Monterey High School in 1957. He received an A.A. degree from Monterey Peninsula College in 1964 after attending at night while working full time in restaurants.

Bert started his restaurant career at the age of 13, and has worked as everything from dishwasher and chef to manager and owner.

Bert's specialty has always been the culinary arts. He is a certified executive chef and a member of the American Culinary Federation and the American Academy of Chefs, which is the honor society of the American Culinary Federation. He is also a member of the American Institute for Food and Wine, founded by Julia Child, and is a member of the Confrerie de la Chaine des Rotisseurs, in which he holds the office of vice chancellor-argenter. He is also a member of the Wine Investigation for Novices and Oenophiles and a master knight of

the Monterey chapter of Knights of the Vine. He is a member of the Guild of Sommeliers from England and the Toques Blanches International Society.

Locally, Bert has served as president, vice president, and secretary of the Monterey Peninsula Chefs Association. He is currently its chairman of the board. In 1982, he founded the Culinary Arts Salon held at the California Wine Festival in Monterey.

Bert helped institute the culinary program at Monterey Peninsula College and has also been active with the college as a guest lecturer and a strong supporter of education in the culinary arts. Bert is a vice president of the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce and is a member of the chamber's visitor education committee.

In 1982, Bert received both the Distinguished Alumni Award from the California Association of Colleges and the Monterey Peninsula Chefs Association President's Award for outstanding service. In 1983, the Chefs Association named him Chef of the Year, and he was chosen as the California Restaurant Association Chef of the Year in 1984.

Bert, his wife, Velma, and their daughter and two sons live in Monterey.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Balestreri and Bert Cutino have made tremendous contributions to the Monterey Peninsula, and the community is going to give them a well-deserved tribute. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating them and their families and in wishing them the best of luck in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to be present and voting on November 6, 1985, for rollcall vote Nos. 391 through 395. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 391, final passage of House Joint Resolution 36, Women in Armed Forces Memorial; "aye" on roll No. 392, final passage of H.R. 2205, Korean Conflict Memorial; "aye" on roll No. 393, final passage of House Joint Resolution 142, Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial; "nay" on roll No. 394, the Edgar amendment regarding the Mississippi River and tributaries flood control project, to H.R. 6, water resources development; and, "aye" on roll No. 395, the Weaver amendment to deauthorize the Elk Creek Dam project, to H.R. 6, water resources development.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McKINNEY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SABO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOULTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLINGER in two instances.

Mr. SCHUETTE.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. CHAPPIE.

Mr. HILLIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SABO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WHEAT.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. GARCIA in three instances.

Mr. BOUCHER.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. LAFALCE in two instances.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. SOLARZ.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 3, 1985, through November 9, 1985, as "National Drug Abuse Education Week"; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the week beginning October 27, 1985, as "National Alopecia Areata Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 8, 1985, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and

U.S. dollars utilized by them during the second and third quarters of calendar year 1985 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brooks, Sharon.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Corn, Lynne.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Dentler, John.....	6/1	6/9	Scotland.....	617.38	774.00		1,443.60				2,217.60
Franklin, Webb, M.C.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Lowry, Mike, M.C.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Marquette, Linda.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)		* 271.72		627.72
Marshall, Curt.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Puah, Sheila.....	5/30	6/3	Panama.....		356.00		(^a)				356.00
Tallon, Robin, M.C.....	5/23	5/31	Germany.....		525.00		1,666.00				2,191.00
Tauzin, Billy, M.C.....	5/30	6/2	Panama.....		267.00		* 297.00				564.00
Studds, Gerry E., M.C.....	5/3	5/5	Canada.....	333.77	246.00		514.33				800.33
							* 40.00				
Westcott, Jacquelyn.....	4/20	5/5	Argentina.....	589,680	1,092.00		2,063.19				3,290.00
							* 134.81				
Committee total.....					5,396.00		6,158.93		271.72		11,826.65

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

^a Military transportation.

^b Overtime.

^c Returned to congressional district, Louisiana, military transportation to Panama.

^d Ground transportation.

WALTER B. JONES, Chairman, Oct. 23, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Webb Franklin.....	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China.....	1478.4	528.00					1478.4	528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand.....		11,790		432.00				432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong.....	2,354.50	304.00					2,354.50	304.00
Military transportation.....							10,903.40				10,903.40
Code.....											
Hon. E de la Garza.....	6/28	7/3	Mexico.....	135,450	450.00					135,450	450.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Commercial transportation.....							462.00				462.00
Hon. Charles Whitley.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Hon. Robin Tallon.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Hon. Sid Morrison.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Hon. Arlan Stangeland.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Hon. Lindsay Thomas.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Commercial transportation.....							370.39				370.39
A. Mario Castillo.....	6/27	7/3	Mexico.....	158,025	525.00					158,025	525.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Commercial transportation.....							378.00				378.00
Charles Rawls.....	6/29	7/3	Mexico.....	112,875	375.00					112,875	375.00
Military transportation.....							2,163.00				2,163.00
Other expenditures.....	6/27	7/3	Mexico City, Mexico.....								
Local transportation.....								400,250	1,191.22	400,250	1,191.22
FSN Embassy support personnel.....								222,767	608.74	222,767	607.74
Code.....											
Hon. E de la Garza.....	8/4	8/6	Finland.....	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union.....		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany.....	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal.....	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation.....							5,045.39				5,045.39
Hon. Harold L. Volkmer.....	8/4	8/6	Finland.....	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union.....		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany.....	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal.....	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation.....							5,045.39				5,045.39
Hon. Robert M. Tallon.....	8/4	8/6	Finland.....	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union.....		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany.....	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal.....	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation.....							5,045.39				5,045.39
Hon. Arlan I. Stangeland.....	8/4	8/6	Finland.....	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union.....		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany.....	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal.....	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation.....							5,045.39				5,045.39
Hon. Charles O. Whitley.....	8/4	8/6	Finland.....	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union.....		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany.....	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Military transportation	8/16	8/18	Portugal	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Hon. Charles F. Hatcher	8/4	8/6	Finland	1,554.95	260.00		5,045.39			1,554.95	5,045.39
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation							5,045.39				5,045.39
A.M. Castillo	8/4	8/6	Finland	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation							5,045.39				5,045.39
Charles R. Rawls	8/4	8/6	Finland	1,554.95	260.00					1,554.95	260.00
	8/6	8/13	Soviet Union		400.00						400.00
	8/13	8/16	Germany	903.96	324.00					903.96	324.00
	8/16	8/18	Portugal	35,856	216.00					35,856	216.00
Military transportation							5,045.39				5,045.39
Other expenditures	8/6	8/13	Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Uzbekistan, Soviet Union								
Local transportation									316.05		316.05
Representation function									350.00		350.00
Miscellaneous									79.50		79.50
Other expenditures	8/16	8/18	Lisbon, Portugal								
FSN Embassy support personnel									3,477.83		3,477.83
Local transportation									1,045.47		1,045.47
Control rooms									957.10		957.10
Telephone									715.15		715.15
Miscellaneous									181.46		181.46
Committee total					14,089.00		69,780.91		8,922.52		92,792.43

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation to West Germany, Italy, France, June 30 to July 7, 1985:											
Gray, Hon. William H., III	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Latta, Hon. Delbert L.	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Lowry, Hon. Mike	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/3	Italy		128.00				1,448.87		1,448.87
Transportation, Department of the Air Force									748.54		748.54
Commercial air transportation											
Williams, Hon. Pat	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00				5.44		267.44
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Martin, Hon. Lynn	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Atkins, Hon. Chester G.	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Pruitt, Mr. Steven	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Walters, Mr. Robert	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Bogenberger, Mr. Patrick	6/30	7/2	West Germany		224.00						224.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy		256.00						256.00
	7/4	7/5	West Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France		262.00						262.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							3,974.10				3,974.10
Delegation expenses	7/2	7/4	Italy						1,550.81		1,550.81
	7/5	7/7	France						1,451.69		1,451.69
Committee total					6,588.00		33,990.21		3,007.94		43,586.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Per diem overpayment in the amount of \$128 returned to U.S. Treasury on Oct. 24, 1985.

WILLIAM H. GRAY III, Chairman, Oct. 24, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Representative William Clay	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		3,562.00				4,460.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Representative Charles A. Hayes	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		3,188.00				4,086.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Fred Feinstein	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		3,865.00				4,763.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Phyllis Borzi	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		3,865.00				4,763.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Russel J. Mueller	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		2,136.00				3,034.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Daniel V. Yager	8/23	8/25	England		314.00		1,273.00				2,171.00
	8/26	8/30	Ireland		584.00						
Local transportation/Ireland							1,448.66				1,448.66
Richard Fiesta	7/12	7/21	England		1,208.00		1,857.90		* 210.00		3,275.90
Bruce Wood	7/12	7/21	England		1,208.00		1,857.90		* 210.00		3,275.90
Committee total					7,804.00		23,053.46		420.00		31,277.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Conference registration fee.

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Chairman, Oct. 28, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Bereuter, D	8/16	8/18	Denmark		222.00		89.00		162.81		473.81
	8/18	8/23	Norway		810.00						810.00
Commercial transportation							312.00				310.00
Bolognese, K	8/26	8/28	United Kingdom		314.00						314.00
	8/28	9/5	France		1,128.00						1,128.00
Commercial transportation							3,769.00				3,769.00
Bonker, D	8/1	8/2	Canada		79.00						79.00
Military transportation one way							812.43				812.43
Commercial transportation one way							98.99				98.99
Booker, S	8/11	8/11	United Kingdom		31.40						31.40
	8/12	8/14	Sudan		504.00						504.00
	8/14	8/17	Ethiopia		394.00						394.00
	8/17	8/18	Kenya		113.00						113.00
	8/18	8/20	Somalia		216.00						216.00
Total					3,811.40		5,081.42		162.81		9,055.63
Commercial transportation	8/20	8/22	Italy		256.00						256.00
Bruce, T	8/11	8/13	United Kingdom		314.00		4,675.00				4,675.00
	8/13	8/19	Italy		768.00						314.00
	8/19	8/22	France		423.00						768.00
Commercial transportation							4,289.00				4,289.00
	9/9	8/10	Germany		108.00						108.00
	9/10	9/14	Switzerland		*483.80						483.80
Commercial transportation							3,472.00				3,472.00
Burton, D	8/11	8/15	South Korea		532.00						532.00
Commercial transportation											
Bush, R	6/29	7/1	Soviet Union		350.00						350.00
	7/6	7/7	Germany		61.94						61.94
Commercial transportation							2,379.02				2,379.02
Total					3,296.74		14,815.02				18,111.76
Calabia, D.T	8/3	8/11	South Africa		864.00		114.00				978.00
	8/11	8/13	Zimbabwe		216.00						216.00
	8/13	8/15	Zambia		*111.00						111.00
	8/15	8/16	Kenya		60.55						60.55
	8/17	8/20	Sudan		603.00						603.00
Commercial transportation							4,738.00				4,738.00
Curran, T	8/18	8/21	Kenya		339.00						339.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	8/17	8/18	United Kingdom		157.00						157.00
	8/25	8/27	France		282.00						282.00
Commercial transportation							1,850.00				1,850.00
Dymally, M.M.	9/1	9/5	Canada		148.00						148.00
Commercial transportation							485.42				485.42
	9/9	9/11	India		264.00						264.00
Commercial transportation							6,253.00				6,253.00
Total					3,044.55		13,440.42				16,484.97
Finley, R.M.	9/9	9/10	Germany		^a 70.60						70.60
	9/10	9/14	Switzerland		^a 316.30						316.30
Commercial transportation							3,472.00				3,472.00
Galey, M.E.	7/12	7/27	Kenya		1,695.00						1,695.00
	7/27	7/28	Zimbabwe		108.00						108.00
	7/28	8/3	South Africa		81.00						81.00
Commercial transportation one way							1,974.00				1,974.00
Military transportation one way							3,519.35				3,519.35
Holloway, A.	8/7	8/10	Egypt		440.00						440.00
	8/10	8/14	Sudan		672.00						672.00
	8/14	8/17	Ethiopia		394.00						394.00
	8/17	8/18	Kenya		113.00						113.00
	8/18	8/20	Somalia		216.00						216.00
	8/20	8/21	Italy		128.00						128.00
Commercial transportation							4,722.00				4,722.00
Total					4,233.90		13,687.35				17,921.25
Ingram, G.	8/7	8/12	Canada		342.00						342.00
Commercial transportation							285.44				285.44
Johnson, V.C.	8/5	8/8	Guatemala		^a 137.00						137.00
	8/8	8/13	Costa Rica		540.00						540.00
	8/13	8/16	El Salvador		^a 302.00						302.00
Commercial transportation							1,164.00				1,164.00
Kurz, R.	8/6	8/9	Panama		366.00						366.00
	8/9	8/12	Honduras		387.00						387.00
	8/12	8/16	El Salvador		540.00						540.00
Commercial transportation							1,333.00				1,333.00
Levin, H.	9/19	9/23	United Kingdom		492.00						492.00
Commercial transportation							2,795.38				2,795.38
Total					3,106.00		5,577.82				8,683.82
MacKay, B.	8/16	8/17	Mexico		75.00						75.00
	8/17	8/20	Nicaragua		225.00						225.00
	8/20	8/23	El Salvador		225.00						225.00
Commercial transportation							733.50				733.50
McBride, R.W.	9/9	9/10	Germany		108.00						108.00
	9/10	9/14	Switzerland		492.00						492.00
Commercial transportation							3,472.00				3,472.00
Nolan, L.P.	8/5	8/8	Guatemala		^a 188.00						188.00
	8/8	8/13	Costa Rica		540.00						540.00
	8/13	8/16	El Salvador		^a 298.00						298.00
Commercial transportation							1,164.00				1,164.00
Paolo, B.	7/12	7/29	Kenya		1,921.00						1,921.00
	7/29	7/31	United Kingdom		151.00						151.00
Commercial transportation							3,564.00				3,564.00
Total					4,223.00		8,933.50				13,156.50
Peckham, G.G.	8/11	8/16	Ecuador		540.00						540.00
	8/16	8/17	Argentina		108.00						108.00
	8/17	8/20	Uruguay		324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/23	Chile		366.00				70.49		436.49
Commercial transportation							3,611.00				3,611.00
Pena, R.M.	8/11	8/16	Ecuador		540.00						540.00
	8/16	8/17	Argentina		108.00						108.00
	8/17	8/20	Uruguay		324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/23	Chile		366.00				70.49		436.49
Commercial transportation							3,611.00				3,611.00
Reid, H.	8/8	8/11	Ireland		569.00						569.00
	8/11	8/13	Switzerland		224.00						224.00
	8/13	8/16	Italy		417.00						417.00
	8/16	8/18	Yugoslavia		216.00						216.00
Total					4,102.00		7,222.00		140.98		11,464.98
Military transportation	8/18	8/22	Italy		476.00						476.00
Smith, L.J.	8/10	8/13	United Kingdom		471.00		4,876.42				4,876.42
	8/13	8/19	Italy		768.00		1,051.77				1,552.77
	8/19	8/22	France		423.00						423.00
Commercial transportation							4,515.00				4,515.00
Solarz, S.J.	8/3	8/10	South Africa		864.00				114.00		978.00
	8/9	8/9	Mozambique								
	8/11	8/13	Zimbabwe		^a 106.00						106.00
	8/13	8/15	Zambia		^a 111.00						111.00
	8/15	8/21	Kenya								
	8/21	8/23	Nigeria								
	8/23	8/24	Zaire								
	8/24	8/24	Angola								
	8/25	9/4	Turkey		354.00						354.00
Total					3,219.00		10,557.19				13,776.19
Commercial transportation							6,441.00				6,441.00
Toricelli, R.G.	9/8	9/10	Cyprus		108.00				51.63		159.63
Commercial transportation							3,614.00				3,614.00
Weingberg, H.	8/21	8/23	Jordan		240.00						240.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
No transportation cost											
Weissman, S.	8/3	8/8	Israel		665.00						665.00
	8/8	8/10	Egypt		330.00						330.00
	8/10	8/14	Sudan		672.00						672.00
	8/14	8/17	Ethiopia		394.00						394.00
	8/17	8/18	Kenya		113.00						113.00
	8/18	8/20	Somalia		216.00						216.00
	8/20	8/22	Italy		256.00						256.00
Commercial transportation							4,675.00				4,675.00
Total					3,348.00		14,730.00		51.63		18,129.63
Wolpe, H.	8/3	8/8	Israel		665.00						665.00
	8/8	8/10	Egypt		330.00						330.00
	8/10	8/14	Sudan		672.00						672.00
	8/14	8/17	Ethiopia		394.00						394.00
	8/17	8/18	Kenya		113.00						113.00
	8/18	8/20	Somalia		216.00						216.00
	8/20	8/21	Italy		128.00						128.00
Commercial transportation							4,675.00				4,675.00
Total					2,518.00		4,675.00				7,193.00
Grand total, 3d quarter											133,977.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Represents refund of unused per diem.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rinehart, Caryl	6/29	7/5	England		826.00		932.02		26.25		1,784.27
Fish, Jamie M.	7/1	7/5	England		590.00		722.00		26.25		1,338.25
Savage, Congressman Gus	8/9	8/22	U.S.S.R.		1,372.30		4,789.00		781.74		6,943.04
Hammerschmidt, Congressman John Paul	9/1	9/1	Canada				152.28				152.28
Fabrizio, Vincent F.	9/20	9/22	Japan		37.50						37.50
	9/22	9/29	U.S.S.R.		600.00						600.00
	9/29	9/30	Ireland		98.00						98.00
Military air transportation							5,269.34				5,269.34
Committee total					3,523.80		11,864.64		834.24		16,222.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES J. HOWARD, Chairman, Oct. 28, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kopp		9/19	United States				1,179.00				1,179.00
	9/20	9/28	England		895.05		1,126.88				1,126.88
	9/28	10/3	France		4,703.50		575.00				4,703.50
	10/3		United States						34.00		34.00
Palmer		9/22	United States				1,204.00				1,204.00
	9/23	9/28	England		539.90		692.40				539.90
	9/28	10/6	France		4,703.50		575.00				4,703.50
	10/6		United States						25.00		25.00
Committee total					2,969.28		2,383.00		59.00		5,411.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON FUQUA, Chairman, Oct. 21, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
George M. Grant	8/14	8/18	Canada	507.30	375.00	216.04	159.70			723.34	534.70
Major L. Clark III ³	9/6	9/12	Taiwan						375.00		375.00
Thomas G. Powers ³	9/6	9/12	Taiwan						375.00		375.00
Committee total					375.00		159.70		75.00		1,284.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Registration fee was paid in advance, before trip was cancelled. Refund of registration fee has not been received as of October 30, 1985.

PARREN J. MITCHELL, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Guy Molinair	8/13	8/14	Bahamas				498.26				498.26
Commercial air											498.26
Limousine							225.00				225.00
Hotel									125.01		125.01
Committee total							725.26		125.01		848.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

G.V. MONTGOMERY, Chairman, Oct. 31, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sam Gibbons	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.18			586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00		93.06	60.75			457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. J.J. Pickle	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.18			586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00		93.06	60.75			457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. James R. Jones	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	113,280	480.00		128.86	67.18			675.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/21	Hong Kong	1,181.05	152.00		92.06	60.75			304.81
Transportation by Department of Defense							6,164.13				6,164.13
Hon. Donald J. Pease	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.18			586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00		93.06	60.75			457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. Beryl Anthony	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.18			586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00		93.06	60.75			457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. Bill Frenzel	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.17			586.03
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00			27.34			423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00		93.06	60.75			457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. Richard T. Schulze	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00			4.77			162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86	67.18			586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Hon. Carroll A. Campbell, Jr.	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							8,094.19				8,094.19
Commercial transportation											1,027.00
Hon. William M. Thomas	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Thelma Askey	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
John Hardt	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Janet Nuzum	8/3	8/8	Japan	120,480	510.00		128.86		67.18		706.04
	8/8	8/15	China	1,319.23	456.00						456.00
	8/12	8/23	Hong Kong	11,779.70	1,518.00			93.06	128.13		1,739.19
Transportation by Department of Defense								3,933.01			3,933.01
Commercial transportation								1,683.41			1,683.41
Franklin Phifer, Jr.	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
Joanna Shelton	7/28	8/7	Japan	280,845	1,185.00		128.86		67.18		1,381.04
	8/8	8/11	China	1,145.83	396.00						396.00
	8/12	8/21	Thailand	28,872	1,080.00						1,080.00
Transportation by Department of Defense								560.15			560.15
Commercial transportation								2,662.00			2,662.00
Graciela P. Sullivan	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
	8/4	8/8	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/8	8/11	China	859.37	297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/13	Nepal	2,610	150.00						150.00
	8/13	8/17	India	4,788	396.00				27.34		423.34
	8/17	8/20	Thailand	8,635	324.00						324.00
	8/20	8/24	Hong Kong	2,362.10	304.00			93.06	60.75		457.81
	8/21	8/22	China	433.50	150.00						150.00
Transportation by Department of Defense							9,464.19				9,464.19
George J. Weise	7/30	8/2	Canada	427.48	316.00				4.77		320.77
	8/3	8/6	Japan	92,040	390.00		128.86		67.18		586.04
	8/7	8/16	India	10,949.40	904.00						904.00
	8/17	8/18	Thailand	2,878	108.00						108.00
Transportation by Department of Defense								2,749.87			2,749.87
Commercial transportation								2,680.00			2,680.00
Refus Yerxa	8/1	8/2	Canada	213.74	158.00				4.77		162.77
Transportation by Department of Defense							812.43				812.43
Committee total					34,004.00		132,614.57		2,358.97		168,977.54

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. George E. Brown, Jr.	6/28	6/30	North America		223.89						223.89
	6/30	7/8	Central America		782.00						782.00
	7/8	7/9	West Indies		172.00						172.00
Military aircraft							12,685.00				12,685.00
Delegation expenses									59.31		59.31
Michael J. O'Neil, staff	6/28	6/30	North America		223.89						223.89
	6/30	7/8	Central America		782.00						782.00
	7/8	7/9	West Indies		172.00						172.00
Military aircraft							12,685.00				12,685.00
Hon. Andy Ireland	8/3	8/19	South America		1,910.00						1,910.00
Military aircraft							573.82		89.48		2,573.30
Robert J. Surrette, staff	8/5	8/16	Asia		875.00		7,536.10				7,536.10
Commercial air							2,142.00				2,142.00
Robert J. Fitch, staff	8/13	8/20	Europe						105.77		105.77
Richard H. Giza, staff	8/11	8/21	Europe		795.00						795.00
Commercial air							2,486.00				2,486.00
Bernard Raimo, Jr., staff	8/11	8/21	Europe		795.00						795.00
Commercial air							2,486.00				2,486.00
David S. Addington, Staff	8/22	8/29	Africa		629.00						629.00
	8/29	9/2	Europe		124.00						124.00
Commercial air							3,581.00				3,581.00
Duane P. Andrews, staff	9/22	9/24	Europe		262.00						262.00
Commercial air							1,879.47				1,879.47
Committee total					7,745.78		46,054.39		254.56		54,054.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LEE H. HAMILTON, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1985.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2228. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting notice of a new and an altered Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2229. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting notice of a new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2230. A letter from the National Adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the national convention held in New Orleans, LA, July 21-25, 1985, including an independent audit of receipts and expenditures as of December 31, 1984, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1332 and Public Law 88-504, section 3. (H. Doc. No. 99-123); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 312. A resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 441, joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986 (Rep. 99-361). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 313. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1616, a bill to require employers to notify and consult with employees before ordering a plant clos-

ing or permanent layoff (Rep. 99-362). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYES (for himself and Mrs. BURTON of California):

H.R. 3706. A bill to amend chapter 44 (relating to firearms) of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of handguns commonly called Saturday night specials; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3707. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that entitlement to a survivor annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System in the case of certain individuals who are mentally or physically disabled shall not be affected by marriage if the spouse is incapable of self-support due to a disability; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 3709. A bill to provide that court for the southern district of Florida shall be held in Naples, FL; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 3710. A bill to prevent distortions in the reapportionment of the House of Representatives caused by the use of census population figures which include illegal aliens; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 3711. A bill to modify the deadlines applicable to hazardous waste disposal facilities required to certify compliance with certain financial responsibility requirements under the Solid Waste Disposal Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida:

H.R. 3712. A bill to provide for grants under the Bureau of Justice Assistance to local governments for innovative antiterrorism plans for deep draft ports and international airports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH (for himself and Mr. DAUS):

H.R. 3713. A bill to restore to the Social Security Trust Funds and other Federal retirement funds losses resulting from noninvestments, redemptions, and disinvestments in connection with efforts to meet the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3714. A bill to revitalize the U.S. copper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. WALKER):

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution congratulating Sharon Christa McAuliffe on her selection as the first teacher in space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. RITTER (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. PEASE):

H. Res. 314. Resolution expressing the sense of the U.S. House of Representatives that Miroslav Medvid should not be allowed to be removed from the United States until a complete investigation can determine whether he has been accorded all rights due him as a possible defector, and until he is accorded those rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 64: Mr. WEISS.
H.R. 66: Mr. SUNIA.
H.R. 67: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. SUNIA.
H.R. 1457: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 1769: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1918: Mr. PARRIS.
H.R. 2349: Mr. FAWELL.
H.R. 2814: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. DAUB.
H.R. 3109: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 3469: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MITCH-

ELL, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Ms. MIKULSKI.
H.R. 3507: Mr. GRAY of Illinois.
H.R. 3557: Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. SCHUETTE.
H.J. Res. 400: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COATS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. BADHAM.
H.J. Res. 421: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.